DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 499 HE 016 361

TITLE	Services for Students with Disabilities in California Public Higher Education. A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1982-83 Budget Act.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	CR-83-15
PUB DATE	21 Mar 83
NOTE	85p.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accessibility (for Disabled); Adult Students; *Ancillary School Services; *College Students; Community Colleges; Developmental Disabilities; *Disabilities; *Educational Policy; Financial Support; Postsecondary Education; Public Education; Special Classes; *Special Education; State Aid; State Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The development and current status of state-supported educational programs serving disabled students in California public colleges and universities are briefly reviewed, and current state policy and recommendations for future policy are addressed. While programs at all three public segments are considered, the California Community Colleges are covered separately because of the unique nature of their funding, program design, and variety of students. After presenting background information on the growth and current status of programs serving disabled students, the following issues affecting all three segments are considered: the groups to be served, services to be provided, funding of the services, evaluation of programs, and the effect of the transfer of services from the Department of Rehabilitation. Issues related to the community colleges include: community college programs for disabled students, special classes, the operation and funding of special classes, and the delivery of educational services to adults with developmental disabilities. Appendices include a list of 15 support services, a proposed budget projection, information on categories and subcategories of disabilities, and a 1979 report of the statewide task force on services to disabled students. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232499

SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

A REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE IN RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL LANGUAGE IN THE 1982-83 BUDGET ACT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Calif. Postsecondary Education Comm
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE016 361

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

The California Postsecondary Education Commission was created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1974 as the successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education in order to coordinate and plan for education in California beyond high school. As a state agency, the Commission is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Governor. The other six represent the major educational systems of the State.

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it takes action on staff studies and adopts positions on legislative proposals affecting postsecondary education. Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its other publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.

Commission Report 83-15

Adopted March 21, 1983

CONTENTS

		Page
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS		
	Legislative Policies Regarding Program Operations	
	Legislative Principles Regarding Program Funding	
	Community College Sepcial Classes	
	Segmental and Commission Activities	
PREFACE		
	Purpose and Scope	
	Study Methodology	
	Relationship to Other Studies	
	Overview of the Report	
ONE:	GROWTH AND CURRENT STATUS OF PROGRAMS SERVING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	1
	Development of the Programs	1
	Students Currently Served	4
	Expenditures and Services Provided	5
	Revenues	10
TWO:	ISSUES AFFECTING ALL THREE SEGMENTS	13
	Who Should Be Served?	13
	The Temporarily Disabled	13
	Students With Learning Disabilities	14
	What Services Should Be Provided?	17
	The AB 77 Model	17
	The 1979 Task Force Model	18
	The 1981 Commission Model	19
	The Department of Finance Report	20
	Program Purpose	21
	Integration of Services	23
	How Should These Services Be Funded?	25
	Present Funding Mechanisms	25
	Future Funding Principles	26
	How Should Programs for Students With Disabilities Be Evaluated?	30
	What Has Been the Effect of the Transfer of Services from the Department of Rehabilitation?	32

THREE: ISSUES RELATED TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES 37

The Nature and Scope of Programs for Students with Disabilities in the Community Colleges 37

Special Classes for Students With Disabilities 38

How Should Special Classes Be Operated and Funded? 41

How Should the State Deliver Educational Services to Adults With Developmental Disabilities 42

FOUR: CONCLUSION 47

APPENDICES

A. Support Services 49

B. Proposed Budget Projection Format 51

C. Categories and Subcategories of Disabilities 55

D. Report of the Statewide Task Force on Services to Students With Disabilities, August 22, 1979 57

REFERENCES 75

TABLES

		Page
1.	Comparison of 14 Core and Community College Services	3
2.	Number of Disabled Students Served by California Public Colleges and Universities, by Disability Group, 1979-80	6
3.	Number of Disabled Students Served by California Public Colleges and Universities, by Disability Group, 1981-82	6
4.	Disabled Students Served by the University of California, 1979-80 and 1981-82	7
5.	Disabled Students Served by The California State University, 1979-80 and 1981-82	7
6.	Disabled Students Served by the California Community Colleges, 1979-80 and 1981-82	8
7.	Enrollment of Students with Disabilities as a Percentage of Total Enrollment, 1979-80 and 1981-82	9
8.	Estimated Number of Students Served, Expenditures, and Average Costs of Supportive Services to Disabled Students, 1979-80	8-9
9.	Expenditures, 1981-82	10
10.	Revenues, 1981-82	11

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The 24 recommendations in this report concern legislative policies, Community College special classes, and activities of California's three segments of public higher education, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE POLICIES REGARDING PROGRAM OPERATION

The Legislature should adopt the following policies regarding the operation of State-funded programs for students with disabilities:

> . . . students with disabilities who satisfy the disability definitions set forth in Appendix C shall be eligible for services regardless of the duration of their disability, but such students may be counted for funding purposes only if they have received services on three or more separate days (Recommendation 1, page 14).
>
> State funding for specialized tutoring and assessment for students with learning disabilities should be maintained at present levels through June 30, 1984, or until the results of the current study by the Chancellor of the Community Colleges are available and all three segments, in cooperation with the Commission, have agreed on equivalent definitions and general principles regarding verification and assessment of learning disabilities. The Community Colleges and State University should also discuss the training and qualifications of program staff working with students with learning disabilities, but the availability of funds shall not depend on agreement on this subject (Recommendation 2, page 16).
>
> . . . the purposes of programs for students with disabilities are: (1) to provide services necessary to permit students with disabilities to participate in the educational programs operated by the institutions they attend, and (2) to increase the representation of these students. Priority for State funding shall be given to the first of these objectives, and funding shall be made available for outreach, additional specialized programs, and compensatory services when this initial objective has been achieved at all institutions (Recommendation 3, page 23).
>
> In the event that any segment receives State funding pursuant to Recommendations 8 and 9 below to provide outreach, disability related counseling, specialized tutoring, or off-campus

transportation, such funding shall be coordinated through programs serving students with disabilities, but services should be delivered by qualified staff through programs providing similar services to all students, where such programs exist (Recommendation 4, page 24).

. . . the Department of Transportation, working with all three segments and the Commission [shall] develop, by January 1, 1984, a plan for ensuring that all public transit agencies in the State are capable of providing off-campus transportation to students with disabilities within their jurisdiction by July 1, 1986. This plan should include provisions requiring local transit operators to work with programs serving students with disabilities to implement the transfer of services at the local level, and the Department of Transportation should, by April 1, 1986, report to the Legislature on its readiness to implement the plan statewide by July 1, 1986. Programs serving students with disabilities shall not receive State funds to provide off-campus transportation after July 1, 1986, except in those areas where no public transit agency exists or where the plan developed pursuant to this recommendation has not been adequately implemented (Recommendation 5, page 24).

Each segment should develop and submit to the Commission for its review by January 1, 1984, program evaluation standards which it will use in conducting evaluations of its programs for students with disabilities. The Commission with the advice of the Statewide Advisory Committee described in Recommendation 13.3 shall review and comment on these standards by April 1, 1984. At a minimum, the program evaluation process shall include periodic site visits or program audits by each system-wide administration and assessment of student satisfaction. Results of program evaluations should be included by each segment in their biennial report to the Commission, and the Commission shall review and comment on these reports to the respective segments. The Commission shall, by January 1, 1987, prepare a report which includes a comprehensive review of these programs based on the biennial reports called for by the 1979 Task Force Report, information from the Statewide Advisory Committee, and program evaluations conducted by the segments in accord with standards described in this recommendation and Recommendation 13 (Recommendation 14, page 32).

The Education Code should be amended to indicate that the Community Colleges and the State University may elect to provide direct support services (principally reader and interpreter services) through an independent contractor system (Recommendation 16, page 34).

Such a system should permit students to select, hire, and fire those who provide services to them and make the student responsible for determining how, when, and where to work with the service provider. Students would be allotted a fixed number of dollars or hours of service which could be exceeded only with special approval (Recommendation 16.1, page 34).

In the event that a segment chooses not to use the independent contractor system, it must provide such services in accord with the guidelines of the 1979 Task Force report and the requirements of SB 1053 (Recommendation 16.2, page 34).

Programs for students with disabilities should provide the services listed in Appendix A and any other services which may be developed in accord with the recommendations of this report. The Legislature should direct the Department of Rehabilitation to provide all other support services which may be necessary to assist its clients who may be students in public postsecondary education. The Legislature should further direct the Department to work with the three segments and the Commission to develop a system for coordinating services and resolving problems which may arise so that students receive all necessary services. Such procedures should be in place by July 1, 1983 (Recommendation 17, page 35).

The Community Colleges should continue to offer special classes to students with disabilities, and the excess cost of providing these classes should continue to be funded by the State, but the Board of Governors should review Section 56002 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code and current efforts to monitor compliance with this section to ensure that special classes are offered only in those situations in which they constitute the most integrated setting possible or the clear preference of students. That is, the decision about whether a student takes a regular or special class should be based solely on educational need and student choice (Recommendation 19, page 41).

LEGISLATIVE PRINCIPLES REGARDING PROGRAM FUNDING

In order to fund programs for students with disabilities appropriately, the Legislature should:

. . . fund the actual additional cost of providing necessary support services to students with disabilities in public postsecondary education (Recommendation 6, page 27).

In determining the allocation of State funds for this purpose, the process described in Recommendations 7 through 12 below should be utilized (Recommendation 6.1, page 27).

Institutions should continue to utilize all other available resources to support programs for students with disabilities (Recommendation 6.2, page 27).

. . . base funding of programs for students with disabilities in public postsecondary education on projections of costs submitted by each segment during the State budget process, except that costs for providing special classes in Community Colleges shall be funded in accordance with Recommendations 18-22 below. Initial cost projections shall be developed in accordance with Recommendation 12 below and projections for subsequent years should account for anticipated changes due to inflation, workload, and alterations in the program structure. Projections of workload increase should be based on actual increases experienced by the segment in prior years. Requests for increased support based on these projections shall be handled through the regular State budget process. The level of funding may vary between segments because of differences in the actual cost of adequately providing the same services in the three segments (Recommendation 7, page 27).

Each segment shall submit to the Department of Finance a budget request indicating State funds required to provide services to students with disabilities. Those services listed in Appendix A shall be available at each college or campus and shall be funded by the State. It is expressly recognized that services in addition to those listed in Appendix A are not necessarily of lesser priority. Once a service has been approved for State funding it shall become a permanent part of the range of services to be provided by that segment, and the costs of providing such services shall be projected, reported, and funded as described in Recommendation 11 below (Recommendation 8, page 28).

Support services funded by the State shall be consistent with the following:

a. The service is consistent with the stated purposes of programs for students with disabilities as set forth in Recommendation 3.

b. The service does not duplicate services which are otherwise available to all students.

c. The need for the service is directly related to verifiable disabilities of the students to be served.

d. The need for the service is directly related to the person's participation in the educational process.

e. Services should have as their goals mainstreaming, independence, and/or maximum integration of students with disabilities.

f. Services should be provided in the most integrated setting possible consistent with State and federal law, State policy and funding requirements, and segmental missions and policies (Recommendation 9, page 28).

. . . give each segment the discretionary authority to establish a Special Contingency Fund from the funds allocated in accord with Recommendation 11 below. The Special Contingency Fund shall be used for: (a) providing services to students who require services which are extraordinarily costly; and (b) providing inservice training to regular campus faculty and staff to improve their awareness of the needs of students with disabilities (Recommendation 10, pp. 28-29).

. . . fund programs based on budget requests that add together the total cost for interpreters, readers, notetakers, special equipment, mobility assistance, other support services, administration, and the Special Contingency Fund, if any. In each category, the total cost shall be determined by multiplying the number of students to be served by the estimated cost per student of providing the service or services. The estimated cost per student may be derived by the use of any formula, method, or process which the segment may select, so long as the method accurately reflects the true cost of adequately providing these services (Recommendation 11, page 29).

Notwithstanding the above budget projection system, the allocation to the segment shall be considered to be a lump sum and may be allocated to campuses or colleges by any reasonable and equitable method developed by the segments, provided, however, that all services listed in Appendix A must be available on each campus and the use of these funds is expressly restricted to the provision of support services for students with disabilities (Recommendation 11.1, page 29).

As used above, "administration" means the cost of ensuring compliance with these policies and guidelines in programs supported by funds provided under this policy. Costs of administration which are incurred at the campus or college level and at the systemwide level should be combined and reported under administration. Administration may include costs for program development, accountability, and evaluation as well as the costs associated with the operation of advisory committees described in Recommendations 13.1 and 13.2 (Recommendation 11.2, page 29).

By November 1 of each year, each segment will report to the Department of Finance on forms to be developed jointly by the Commission, the segments, and the Department regarding the

actual cost of program operation during the previous fiscal year. These reports shall include the numbers of students served and the costs of serving such students for each of the categories listed above. The report shall also include a breakdown of expenditures from the Special Contingency Fund. The report shall include information on the numbers of students served in each of the disability categories specified in Appendix C, and for the Community Colleges, the developmentally disabled should be separately reported (Recommendation 11.3, page 29).

Except as specifically superseded herein, the guidelines set forth in the attached 1979 Task Force Report remain effective (Recommendation 11.4, page 29).

. . . require that the initial average cost rates described in Recommendation 7 be established through the following process (Recommendation 12, page 29).

The Commission, with the advice of the Statewide Advisory Committee described in Recommendation 13 below, shall, by October 1, 1983, review standards for reasonable levels of State support for the provision of services to students with disabilities and the administration of those services as developed by the three segments. Proposed funding levels shall be reviewed by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance through the regular State budget process and shall serve as the basis of budgeting for the 1984-85 fiscal year (Recommendation 12.1, pp. 29-30).

Estimates of the average cost for providing a given service or services shall be based on the reasonably expected cost of providing a unit of service to a particular student and shall take into account the frequency with which students are likely to use the service (Recommendation 12.2, page 30).

Average cost rates may take into account differences between the segments and may deviate from historical cost figures. However, any deviations from such figures shall be based on specific justifications. In no event may aggregate per capita costs in any segment exceed those for the University of California (Recommendation 12.3, page 30).

Modifications in these initial average cost rates shall be made in accord with Recommendation 7 above (Recommendation 12.4, page 30).

. . . transfer to the Department of Developmental Services funds now allocated to Community Colleges for programs serving adults with developmental disabilities in the State hospitals and in adult development centers. The Department of Developmental Services should use these funds exclusively to purchase on

a fee for service basis the best available educational services for adults with developmental disabilities in the State hospitals and adult development centers. Such services may be purchased from Community Colleges, adult education programs operated by the Department of Education, or other appropriate agencies (Recommendation 24, page 46).

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SPECIAL CLASSES

The Board of Governors should:

. . . review existing regulations related to special classes for students with disabilities, consider the development of guidelines more clearly defining the purposes for which a special class may be offered, and explore methods of better coordinating programs offered by Community Colleges with services for persons with disabilities provided by other agencies (Recommendation 18, page 39).

. . . develop procedures specifically designed to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 56004 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code that students make a voluntary and informed decision before enrolling in a special class. These procedures should include having the student sign a form stating that the alternatives to a special class placement have been described to them and that they have been offered the opportunity to enroll in regular classes with appropriate support services (Recommendation 20, pp. 41-42).

. . . require that special classes that are offered for credit shall meet the same requirements for grading, course content, and course approval as do other credit courses. In addition, special classes with curriculum substantially similar to that of an existing regular class shall not be offered for credit unless the institution can make available appropriate support services to allow any student with a disability to enroll in any regular class offered for credit. Special classes offered for credit shall be funded using the direct excess cost mechanism with modifications for the control of indirect rate charges (Recommendation 21, page 42).

. . . require that non-credit special classes be offered subject to the limitations of Recommendation 20 above, and that such courses shall be eligible for excess cost funding only after approval by the Chancellor in accord with the following:

a. Priority shall be given to those courses which promote independence and/or mainstreaming.

b. Funding shall be made available only in cases where providing instruction in a regular class with support services is not feasible or would not meet the needs of the students.

c. Funding made available shall not, when combined with revenue from ADA, exceed the true cost of offering the course (Recommendation 22, page 42).

. . . adopt a definition of "developmental disabilities" and should make modifications in Sections 56020, 56022, and 56024, of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code to make the disability definitions in these sections consistent with those in Appendix C and the agreements described in Recommendation 2. Programs for students with disabilities in the Community Colleges should provide services only to those students satisfying these definitions and who are capable of meeting the requirements of Section 66201 of the Education Code. Special classes for students with developmental disabilities should be offered in accord with Recommendations 18-22 above except as provided in Recommendation 24 below (Recommendation 23, page 43).

SEGMENTAL AND COMMISSION ACTIVITIES

Programs for students with disabilities shall include advisory committees as follows:

The Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should require that each campus establish an advisory committee on services to students with disabilities that shall meet regularly to review the operation of these programs. This committee should be advisory to the chief administrative officer of the campus. The committee should have substantial representation of students, faculty, and staff who are representative of as wide a variety of disabilities as possible and may also include representatives of appropriate community or State agencies, consumer groups, and any other appropriate organizations or individuals. Functions of the committee should include assisting in the evaluation of current campus policies and procedures relating to students with disabilities; developing plans for programs and services for these students; and setting priorities, developing timelines, and assisting in the estimation of costs associated with support services.

The Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should each establish a systemwide advisory committee on services to students with disabilities that shall meet regularly to review the

operation of these programs. These committees should be advisory to and recognized by the chief administrative officer of each segment. These committees should have substantial representation of students, faculty, and staff who are representative of as wide a variety of disabilities as possible and may also include representatives of appropriate community or State agencies, consumer groups, and any other appropriate organizations or individuals. Functions of the committees should include assisting in the implementation and evaluation of programs for services to students with disabilities; developing proposals as necessary for the revision of systemwide policies for these students; and advising the systemwide administration on their needs and concerns (Recommendation 13 and 13.1-13.2, page 31).

In developing average cost rates pursuant to Recommendation 12, cost increases which may be attributable to the transfer of services from the Department of Rehabilitation shall be included (Recommendation 15, page 33).

PREFACE

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

In Item 6420-001-001, subitem 2, of Supplemental Language to the 1982-83 Budget Act, the Legislature directed:

> The CPEC shall conduct a study of educational programs and supportive services offered to students with disabilities in the three public segments and to clients in state hospitals. The commission shall consult with the State Department of Education, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the University of California, the California State University, the Department of Finance, the Department of Developmental Services, the Legislative Analyst's office and other affected and interested parties. The agencies and parties specified shall provide whatever information is needed by CPEC to satisfy the requirements of this section. Such study shall include special classes offered both on- and off-campus and the current methods of funding both services and special classes for students with disabilities in the three segments. Such study will be based, to the extent possible, on existing data on courses, services and funding for students with disabilities, and shall make recommendations on programmatic and funding changes. The study shall be completed by 2/15/83.

In response, this report is designed to provide:

1. an overview of the development and current status of programs serving students with disabilities in California public postsecondary education;

2. a comprehensive discussion of major questions of State policy related to these programs; and

3. recommendations for future policy.

The scope of the report is limited to services to students with disabilities who participate in State-supported educational programs. It deals with programs at all three public segments, but in Part Three it gives special attention to programs at the California Community Colleges because of the unique nature of their funding, program design, and variety of students.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Several studies over the past five years have collected and analyzed a great deal of information about the operation and funding of programs for students with disabilities in California public higher education, including clients in State hospitals. Thus, this report focuses on a discussion of the issues rather than on statistical displays, and it relies largely on existing data rather than being based on the collection of new data. The Supplemental Language which requested this report specifically directed the Commission to use available information wherever possible. Accordingly, the staff of the Commission developed an issue-oriented outline and a set of narrowly focused data-collection requirements for the study. A work group composed of project staff and representatives from the three segments discussed the outline and data-collection requirements at a meeting in August 1982. The segmental representatives to this group were:

A. T. Brugger, Special Assistant for Student Affairs Services, University of California

Donald Duren, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, The California State University

Ronald Dyste, Administrator for Specially Funded Programs, California Community Colleges

Robert F. Howard, Specialist/Specially Funded Programs, California Community Colleges

Philip Johnston, Associate Dean of Student Affairs, The California State University

Rosalie Passovoy, Program Analyst/Student Affairs, University of California

Jesse D. Shaw, Associate Director of Budget Analysis and Planning, University of California

Based on the recommendations of this group, Commission staff developed a revised outline and forms for collecting needed information. Each segment also supplied the staff with narrative evaluations of their programs, as called for in the guidelines developed in 1979 by the Statewide Task Force on Services to Students with Disabilities.

During September and October, project staff met with interested individuals, consumer groups, and agencies to gather information and discuss the issues to be addressed by the report. In December, a draft of the report was presented to the project work group and distributed for written comment to other interested parties. Based on their responses, the report was revised and adopted by the Commission in March 1983. The study methodology was designed to produce widespread discussion of all major issues confronting programs serving students with disabilities

in the hope of achieving consensus among all interested parties on possible solutions.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STUDIES

Because this report is intended to be a comprehensive review of issues confronting programs for students with disabilities, it touches on a number of topics which are themselves the subject of more narrowly focused studies, including those being conducted by the Department of Finance and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges on programs for students with learning disabilities as well as another study by the Chancellor's Office on efforts to develop comprehensive evaluation and compliance systems that will include student demographic data, special class attendance data, evaluation of these data, data on services received, fiscal audits, and comparative analyses of student educational outcomes.

The Commission's own recently completed study of remedial education, Promises to Keep, also overlaps with this report because of the difficulty of separating remedial programs from those serving students with learning disabilities. In these several areas of overlap, this report presents current information about the other studies that are still underway, but it does not make definitive recommendations on all topics addressed by them.

OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT

Part One displays available information about the growth and current status of programs for students with disabilities in California public postsecondary education, including numbers of students served, services provided, and the costs of delivering those services. Part Two discusses several issues which relate to all three segments and offer 17 recommendations regarding future State policy affecting all three. Part Three focuses on those issues involving only the Community Colleges and contains seven recommendations that address these issues. Part Four concludes with a brief description of the expected impact of the major recommendations of the report.

ONE

GROWTH AND CURRENT STATUS OF PROGRAMS SERVING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAMS

Programs for students with disabilities in California's public institutions of higher education developed at different times and in response to somewhat different needs in each of the three segments. An understanding of these historical differences is an important prerequisite to the development of recommendations regarding their future operation.

In the California Community Colleges, programs for students with disabilities evolved from special education in the public schools. Indeed, until the mid-1970s, school and Community College programs shared the same authorizing statutes and funding systems, although the Community Colleges also derived some early funding from the Vocational Education Act of 1968. Because of compulsory attendance laws, special education in the public schools has as a primary focus the delivery of education to even the most hard-to-serve populations. Given this origin and the expansive mission of the Community Colleges, it is not surprising that their programs for students with disabilities provide a broad range of services to a diverse group of students and stress outreach to persons with disabilities who have traditionally been outside the realm of postsecondary education.

By contrast, programs at the University of California and The California State University have been developed largely for and by those students who have managed to enter college despite their disabilities and the lack of any formal accommodations to their needs. The first program in the University began at UCLA in 1944. By the early 1970s, Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside had also organized programs as had many of the campuses of the State University. These programs were created with existing institutional resources or grant funds at the urging of students and received no recognition or special funding from the State. They were therefore small, limited in scope, and designed to provide support to students enrolled in regular classes.

Although programs at the Community Colleges received funds from the State for special education, much of their early development went unnoticed at the State level until the mid-1970s, when a number of factors combined to bring the programs for students with disabilities in all three segments to the attention of the Legislature. Funding for the Community Colleges, which was based on special education in the schools, simultaneously became inadequate to support the increasing numbers of students and too complex and cumbersome to administer. This led to the passage of AB 77 (c.275 Stats. 1976) which established a new funding formula for the Community College programs. In 1974, internal pressure for program expansion led the State University to request funds for a pilot project from the Legislature, and the success of this project resulted in the inclusion of approximately $500,000 in the 1976-77 budget for support of

State University programs. Also in 1976, the Legislature passed Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 201, calling on all three segments of public postsecondary education to develop plans for overcoming the underrepresentation of students with disabilities, and modeling this request after ACR 151 of 1974, which had called on them to develop plans for overcoming the underrepresentation of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students.

ACR 201 stated the Legislature's intent to fund programs designed to overcome underrepresentation. So far, however, the Legislature has not provided funds specifically designated to implement ACR 201, although AB 77 does fund similar services at the Community Colleges. ACR 201 also asked the Commission to work with the segments to integrate their planning, and this effort resulted in the development of the State Plan for Increasing the Representation of Students with Disabilities in Public Postsecondary Education, which was transmitted to the Legislature in June 1978. One of the recommendations of this plan was that programs for students with disabilities be established at each college or university campus.

In May 1977, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued regulations implementing Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC 794) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by any agency, including educational institutions, that receives federal funds. While neither the State nor the federal government has allocated funds for compliance with Section 504, these regulations provided additional impetus for educational institutions and students to seek increased State support for programs serving students with disabilities. Meanwhile, the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 drastically changed the system of financing Community Colleges. Along with increased numbers of students with disabilities and declining revenue it helped undermine the stability that AB 77 was designed to bring to programs for students with disabilities.

In light of these circumstances, the Legislature responded to requests for increased support from the segments and students with disabilities by including funds in the 1979-80 Budget Act to support programs for students with disabilities in all three segments. These funds were not made available as a direct response to ACR 201 or Section 504. Rather, they were made available at the University and State University so that qualified students with disabilities could attend any institution of their choice and receive necessary support services. The Legislature stated in AB 77 that funding of programs in Community Colleges should not limit the choice of an institution by any student. However, since State-funded programs were only available in the Community Colleges, students with disabilities were effectively limited to those institutions. The 1979-80 Budget Act also included Supplemental Language establishing a special Statewide Task Force on Services to Students with Disabilities, chaired by the Commission which was charged with the responsibility for developing uniform guidelines for the allocation of these funds. This task force submitted its report to the Legislature in August 1979. It contained a list of "core services" which were to be provided with State funding on each campus (column 1 of Table 1) as well as general guidelines for the operation, funding, and evaluation of the programs. Column 2 of Table 1 lists those services provided by the Community Colleges pursuant to AB 77.
77.

TABLE 1 Comparison of 14 Core and Community College Services

Core Service	Community College Service
Interpreter Services	Interpreters for the Deaf
Reader Services	Reader Services
Notetaker Services	Notetaker Services
Mobility Assistance	Mobility Assistance Wheelchair Loaners Wheelchair Repair Services
Registration Assistance	Registration Assistance
Priority Enrollment	Academic Advising Registration Assistance
Special Parking	Special Parking
Facilitation of Access to All Programs	Resource Center for Disabled Students Vocational Counseling Personal Counseling Academic Advising Registration Assistance Peer Counseling Mobility Assistance
Access to Special Adaptive Equipment	TTY/MCM Devices Print Enlargers Adaptive Equipment
Referral to Appropriate On- or Off-Campus Resources	Resource Center for Disabled Students Vocational Counseling Personal Counseling Job Placement Recruitment/Outreach
Arrangements for Specialized Educational Materials	Resource Center for Disabled Students Diagnostic Learning Assessment Braille Transcription Tutorial Assistance
Establishment and Maintenance of a List of Available Readers, Interpreters, Notetakers, Mobility Assistants, and Attendants	Resource Center for Disabled Students Personal Counseling Off-Campus Transportation Services
Supplemental Orientation as Determined by Individual Needs	Resource Center for Disabled Students Vocational Counseling Personal Counseling Academic Advising Peer Counseling Diagnostic Learning Assessment Vocational Capability Assessment Tutorial Assistance
Test-Taking Arrangements	Resource Center for Disabled Students Academic Advising Tutorial Assistance

Source: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, 1980, p. 50.

These guidelines were intended to define the use of State funds and to ensure that students would receive necessary services regardless of which institution they chose to enter or what subject they chose to study. In general, the programs have succeeded in providing vital services to an increasing number of students with disabilities, but ensuring equity under the constraint of limited resources has proven difficult. Moreover, the Task Force report guidelines were written at a time when the University and State University had limited experience with their programs, and some of the more general guidelines are subject to conflicting interpretation Most important, the differences in mission, philosophy, historical development, and funding among programs in the three segments have caused problems. In particular, subsequent experience has shown that discrepancies exist between the programmatic and funding guidelines in the 1979 Task Force report and those contained in the regulations implementing AB 77 in the Community Colleges. In addition, the propriety of some Community College programs for students with disabilities has come under question during the reexamination of the role of the Community Colleges in the light of increased State funding. To complicate matters further, in July 1981, the Department of Rehabilitation discontinued the provision of readers, interpreters, and certain other auxiliary aid services to its clients who are students in public postsecondary education, causing the Legislature to pass SB 1053 in September, which required the educational institutions to provide these services and which reaffirmed the State's commitment to fund programs to provide all necessary services to students with disabilities.

These several problems, combined with the State's fiscal stringencies since 1979, have limited the resources available to fund fully the commitments of AB 77, ACR 201, SB 1053, and the Statewide Task Force. In addition, the Legislature has asked for a series of reports on issues related to programs for students with disabilities in an attempt to resolve these problems. The first was prepared by the Chancellor of the Community Colleges in response to Supplemental Language in the 1980-81 Budget Act and was transmitted to the Legislature in February 1981. Both that report and the Commission's comments on it contained recommendations regarding funding and operating of the programs, but in the 1981-82 Budget Act the Legislature asked the Department of Finance and the Department of Developmental Services to study the issues further. Both departments submitted reports to the Legislature in Spring 1982, but again consensus was not achieved on the recommendations of these reports, and further studies were requested. The Chancellor of the Community Colleges was asked to study a number of specific issues related to programs in the Community Colleges, while the Commission was asked to prepare this report and make recommendations about operation and funding of these programs as a whole.

STUDENTS CURRENTLY SERVED

The programs currently serve a wide variety of students with disabilities. For funding and reporting purposes, students are classified as those with physical, communication, and learning disabilities. At the University

and State University, the vast majority of students with disabilities are physically disabled. By contrast, nearly one-third of those served by the Community Colleges have either learning or developmental disabilities. Table 2 displays the distribution of students by specific type of disability within these three categories for all three segments for the 1979-80 academic year, while Table 3 provides the same information for 1981-82.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 compare the number of students served in 1979-80 and 1981-82 by the University, State University, and Community Colleges, respectively. They demonstrate that overall growth has been most rapid at the Community Colleges, substantial at the University, and least rapid at the State University. In general, the distribution of students served by disability type has remained fairly constant over the two-year period, except that the number of students with developmental disabilities at the Community Colleges has decreased by approximately 11 percent while the number with learning disabilities at the State University has increased by 152 percent.

Table 7 shows the numbers of students with disabilities served by these programs as a percentage of the total student enrollment of each segment for 1979-80 and 1981-82. In 1981-82, 4.06 percent of the students enrolled at the Community Colleges were disabled, while the figure was 1.33 percent and .90 percent for the State University and the University, respectively. These percentages had increased somewhat since 1979-80, but they still fall far short of the percentage of persons with disabilities in the adult population, which has been estimated to be approximately 19 percent by the Department of Rehabilitation. Of course, the adult population is not an entirely valid comparison base for the University and State University because the Master Plan restricts them to more limited eligibility pools, but no information exists that would permit a completely accurate estimate of how much further these segments have to go in increasing the representation of students with disabilities.

EXPENDITURES AND SERVICES PROVIDED

In 1979-80, the three systems spent a combined total of $22,734,728 to serve 39,970 students with disabilities, for an average cost per student of $569. However, this total figure masks considerable divergence among the segments in their costs of serving these students. Table 8 shows that the University's average cost was $931, while that at the State University was $509, and that at the Community Colleges was $565. Taken together, Tables 3 and 9 show that for 1981-82, the segmental figures were $1,023, $972,* and $621, respectively. These cost differences are discussed in detail in Part Two, but in general they result from differences in the types of students served and the services offered.

*For 1981-82, the State University reported an additional $771,919 in revenue from federal grants and other sources which increased the cost per student substantially over that for 1979-80 when expenditures from these funds were not reported.

TABLE 2 Number of Disabled Students Served by California Public Colleges and Universities, by Disability Group, 1979-80

Disability Group	University of California		California State University		California Community Colleges		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
PHYSICAL DISABILITY								
Vision Impaired	104	10.6%	354	9.6%	2,181	5.5%	2,639	6.0%
Mobility Impaired	564	57.4	2,212	59.9	9,616	24.4	12,392	28.1
Other Impairments	225	22.9	762	20.6	9,611	24.4	10,598	24.1
Subtotal	893	90.9	3,328	90.1	21,408	54.3	25,629	58.2
COMMUNICATION DISABILITY								
Speech Impaired	7	0.7	31	0.8	1,146	2.9	1,184	2.7
Hearing Impaired	41	4.2	170	4.6	2,538	6.5	2,749	6.2
Other Impairments	8	0.8	13	0.4	194	0.5	215	0.5
Subtotal	56	5.7	214	5.8	3,878	9.9	4,148	9.4
LEARNING DISABILITY	33	3.4	89	2.4	7,271	18.5	7,393	16.8
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY	0	0.0	0	0.0	6,819	17.3	6,819	15.5
OTHER DISABILITIES	0	0.0	62	1.7	0	0.0	62	0.1
TOTAL ALL GROUPS	982	100.0	3,693	100.0	39,376	100.0	44,051	100.0

Note: Number indicates headcount. Percent indicates percent of segment's statewide total.

Source: Systemwide administration of the three segments.

TABLE 3 Number of Disabled Students Served by California Public Colleges and Universities, by Disability Group, 1981-82

Disability Group	University of California		California State University		California Community Colleges		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
PHYSICAL DISABILITY								
Vision Impaired	119	9.56%	351	8.25%	2,913	5.71%	3,361	5.97%
Mobility Impaired	865	69.48	2,277	53.50	16,506	32.35	19,428	34.52
Other Impairments	172	13.82	917	21.55	10,124	19.84	11,189	19.88
Subtotal	1,156	92.82	3,545	83.30	29,543	57.90	33,978	60.37
COMMUNICATION DISABILITY								
Speech Impaired	6	0.48	88	2.07	1,860	3.64	1,953	3.47
Hearing Impaired	45	3.61	371[1]	8.72	3,595	7.05	3,766	6.69
Other Impairments	1	0.08	--	--	--	--	1	.0002
Subtotal	52	4.17	459	10.79	5,455	10.69	5,720	10.1602
LEARNING DISABILITY	37	2.97	224	5.26	9,942	19.48	10,195	18.12
OTHER DISABILITIES	--	--	28	.66	--	--	28	.05
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY	0	0.00	-	--	6,086	11.93	6,086	10.81
TOTAL ALL GROUPS	1,245	100.00	4,256	100.00	51,026	100.00	56,277	100.00

1. This includes 231 deaf students served by the special federally funded Center on Deafness at Northridge.

Note: Dashes indicate data are not available.

Source: Systemwide administration of the three segments.

TABLE 4 Disabled Students Served by the University of California, 1979-80 and 1981-82

Disability Group	1979-80 Number	1979-80 Percent	1981-82 Number	1981-82 Percent	Percent of Increase
PHYSICAL DISABILITY					
Vision Impaired	104	10.6%	119	9.56%	14.42%
Mobility Impaired	564	57.4	865	69.48	53.37
Other Impairments	225	22.9	172	13.82	-23.56
COMMUNICATION DISABILITY					
Speech Impaired	7	0.7	6	0.48	-14.29*
Hearing Impaired	41	4.2	45	3.61	9.76
Other Impairments	8	0.8	1	.08	-87.50*
LEARNING DISABILITY	32	3.4	37	2.97	12.12
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY	0	0.0	0	0.00	0.0
TOTAL ALL GROUPS	982	100.0	1,245	100.00	26.78

*The population in this category is small, so percentage changes should be viewed with caution.

Source: Systemwide Administration, University of California.

TABLE 5 Disabled Students Served by The California State University, 1979-80 and 1981-82

Disability Group	1979-80 Number	1979-80 Percent	1981-82 Number	1981-82 Percent	Percent of Increase
PHYSICAL DISABILITY					
Vision Impaired	354	9.6%	351	8.25%	- .85%
Mobility Impaired	2,212	59.9	2,277	53.50	2.94
Other Impairments	762	20.6	917	21.55	20.34
Subtotal	3,328	90.1	3,545	83.30	
COMMUNICATION DISABILITY					
Speech Impaired	31	0.8	88	2.07	183.87
Hearing Impaired	170	4.6	371[1]	8.72	118.24
Other Impairments	13	0.4	--	--	--
Subtotal	214	5.8	459	10.79	
LEARNING DISABILITY	89	2.4	224	5.26	151.69
OTHER DISABILITIES	62	1.7	28	.66	- 55.84
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY	0	0.0	--	--	--
TOTAL ALL GROUPS	3,693	100.0	4,256	100.00	7.72

1. This includes 231 deaf students served by the special federally funded Center on Deafness at Northridge.

Note: Dashes indicate data are not available.

Source: Chancellor's Office, The California State University.

TABLE 6 Disabled Students Served by the California Community Colleges, 1979-80 and 1981-82

Disability Group	1979-80 Number	1979-80 Percent	1981-82 Number	1981-82 Percent	Percent of Increase
PHYSICAL DISABILITY					
Vision Impaired	2,181	5.5%	2,913	5.70%	33.56%
Mobility Impaired	9,616	24.4	16,506	32.30	71.65
Other Impairments	9,611	24.4	10,124	19.80	5.34
COMMUNICATION DISABILITY					
Speech Impaired	1,146	2.9	1,860	3.60	62.30
Hearing Impaired	2,538	6.5	3,595	7.03	41.65
Other Impairments	194	0.5	-	--	--
LEARNING DISABILITY	7,271	18.5	9,942	14.40	36.73
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY	6,819	17.3	6,086	11.90	-10.75
TOTAL ALL GROUPS	39,376	100.0	51,026	100.00	29.59

Note: Dashes indicate data are not available.

Source: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.

TABLE 8 Estimated Number of Students Served, Expenditures, and Average Costs of Supportive Services to Disabled Students, 1979-80

Area of Service	University of California Number Served	University of California Amount Spent	University of California Average Cost	California State University Number Served	California State University Amount Spent	California State University Average Cost
Readers	64	$ 14,917	$ 233	237	$ 34,968	$ 232
Interpreters	16	48,472	3,030	59	83,920	1,422
Special Adaptive Equipment	428	126,684	296	961	411,661	428
On-Campus Transportation	348	40,238	145	240	58,687	245
Other Services	982	354,780	361	3,693	608,575	165
Services in Special Classes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration and Staff	982	329,598	335	3,693	661,712	179
TOTAL	982	$914,689	$ 931	3,693	$1,879,523	$ 509

Note: See the February 1981 report to the Legislature by the Chancellor of the Community Colleges for important qualifications. Data are not strictly comparable.

Source: Systemwide administration of the three segments.

TABLE 7 Enrollment of Students with Disabilities as a Percentage of Total Enrollment, 1979-80 and 1981-82

Year and Percent Change	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Total
1979-80				
Total Enrollment	131,856	306,801	1,100,220	1,538,877
Students with Disabilities	982	3,693	39,376	44,051
Percent of Total	0.74	1.20	3.59	2.86
1981-82				
Total Enrollment	138,726	319,566	1,257,160	1,715,452
Students with Disabilities	1,245	4,256	51,026	56,249
Percent of Total	0.90	1.33	4.06	3.28
PERCENT OF CHANGE				
Total Enrollment	5.21	4.16	14.26	11.47
Students with Disabilities	26.78	15.25	29.59	27.69

Source: Systemwide administration of the three segments.

California Community Colleges			Total		
Number Served	Amount Spent	Average Cost	Number Served	Amount Spent	Average Cost
1,687	$ 594,227	$352	1,988	$ 664,112	$334
1,462	1,272,205	870	1,537	1,404,597	914
12,520	835,508	67	13,909	1,373,853	99
2,412	540,389	224	3,000	639,314	213
20,711	10,843,889	528	25,386	11,807,244	465
22,436	3,561,139	159	22,436	3,561.139	159
39,376	2,293,159	64	44,051	3,284,469	75
35,295	$19,940,516	$565	39,970	$22,734,728	$569

Table 9 demonstrates that readers, interpreters, and transportation each constitute a sizable percentage of each segment's expenditures for students with disabilities. It should also be noted that the Community Colleges spent $13,571,329 (of which $8,368,492 was derived from apportionment revenue) for specialized instruction for the disabled during 1981-82, while State General Funds at the University and State University were used exclusively for support services.

REVENUES

Table 10 shows that for 1981-82 all three segments derived substantial revenue for programs serving students with disabilities from sources other than State General Funds allocated specifically for these programs. The University relied on student registration fees for $144,268, while the State University and the Community Colleges did not have such funds available. Additional revenue for the State University comes largely from federal funds and includes a major grant supporting the National Center on Deafness at the Northridge campus. The Community Colleges generated $8,368,492 in ADA revenue from special closed classes with modified curriculum for students with disabilities, while the University and the State University do not operate such classes and thus derive no revenue from this source.

TABLE 9 Expenditures, 1981-82

	University of California		California State University		California Community Colleges		Total	
Area of Service	Amount Spent	Percent	Amount Spent	Percent	Amount Spent	Percent	Amount Spent	Percent
Readers	$ 75,373	5.92%	$ 676,707	18.89%	$ 3,843,300	12.1%	$ 4,570,380	12.87%
Interpreters	57,368	4.51	557,065	15.55	5,643,380	17.8	5,917,813	16.67
Special Adaptive Equipment	109,817	8.63	345,111	9.63[1,2]	1,367,956	4.3	1,552,884	4.37
On-Campus Transportation	174,401	13.70	77,917	2.18	939,393	3.0	1,113,794	3.14
Other Services	457,748	35.95	1,013,877	28.30	4,538,282	14.3	4,996,030	14.07
Specialized Instruction	671	0.05	--	--	13,571,329	42.8	13,572,000	38.24
Administration and Staff	397,769	31.24	911,595	25.45	1,820,000	5.7	3,771,239	10.62
TOTAL	$1,273,147	100.00%	$3,582,272	100.00%	$31,723,640	100.0%	$35,494,140	100.00%

1. Adaptive Equipment expenditures for the California State University were limited due to 1981-82 State Budget expenditure restriction between February and June, 1982.

2. This includes grants of $270,000 from the Xerox Corporation.

Source: Systemwide administration of the three segments.

TABLE 10 Revenues, 1981-82

Source	University of California		California State University		California Community Colleges		Total	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
State Categorical Funds	$ 720,685[1]	56.42%	$3,062,697	74.02%	$18,395,692	58.0%	$22,179,074	61.5%
Federal Grants	198,730	15.61	771,919[2]	18.66	350,000	1.0	548,730	1.5
VEA Funding	0	0.00	--	--	2,335,434	7.4	2,335,434	6.5
Apportionment Revenue	0	0.00	--	--	8,368,492	26.4	8,368,492	23.2
Student Fees	144,268	11.33	--	--	--	--	144,268	0.4
Institutional Funds	211,864	16.64	--	--	2,274,022	7.2	2,485,886	7.9
Other	0	0.00	303,000	7.32	--	--	0	0.0
TOTAL	$1,273,147	100.00%	$4,137,616	100.00%	$31,723,640	100.0%	$36,059,484	100.0%

1. This amount of $720,685 includes $2,400 used to meet budgetary savings target. Total does not include this amount.

2. This figure represents an estimate by the Chancellor's Office of the amount of federal funds spent to provide core services and includes programs for the learning disabled, services for the deaf at Northridge, trio grant programs at Sacramento and San Diego, and a FIPSE-funded project at Chico.

Source: Systemwide administration of the three segments.

TWO

ISSUES AFFECTING ALL THREE SEGMENTS

WHO SHOULD BE SERVED?

As noted in Part One, programs for students with disabilities currently serve students in three broad categories: those with physical, communication, and learning disabilities. (Appendix C defines these categories.) Physical disabilities include those resulting from visual, mobility, orthopedic, and other functional impairments, while communication disabilities include speech, hearing, and other related impairments. In addition to these three categories of students, the Community Colleges also serve persons with developmental disabilities including those with mental retardation.

Clearly a fundamental question of any program of services for students with disabilities is who should be served by the program. AB 77 and the 1979 Statewide Task Force would both restrict eligibility for services to students with physical, communication, or learning disabilities severe enough to impede their access to education. The Task Force indicated that the determination of whether a person is a student and, therefore, eligible to participate in the program is to be made according to definitions established by the institution which the person attends. But despite the apparent soundness of these definitions, two specific issues remain in the area of eligibility for service.

The Temporarily Disabled

Neither AB 77 nor the Task Force report addresses the question of how long a person must have a disability in order to qualify to receive services. Although the absolute numbers of students involved is probably small, the status of the temporarily disabled is important because of the possiblity that the funding mechanism could be distorted. If funding is based on the average cost per student, each additional student produces a fixed increase in the level of funding, regardless of the costs involved in serving that student. A student with a temporary disability of short duration is likely to require services for only a limited time and, therefore, costs relatively little to serve. A large number of temporarily disabled students could artificially inflate funding levels, and verifying a disability after the fact could prove impossible because of its transitory nature. If the headcount is taken as of a particular census date, however, many temporarily disabled students may not be counted and funding may be inadequate to meet actual need.

Compounding these difficulties is the fact that this problem has not been handled uniformly, so it cannot even be assumed that all programs are affected equally by any inaccuracy in the funding mechanism. Basing funding on the average cost per student for a particular service would

reduce the problem because only funding for those services actually used by a student with a temporary disability would be affected, but nevertheless, some inaccuracy would still exist.

> RECOMMENDATION 1. The Legislature should clarify State policy to indicate that students with disabilities who satisfy the disability definitions set forth in Appendix C shall be eligible for services regardless of the duration of their disability, but such students may be counted for funding purposes only if they have received services on three or more separate days.

This recommendation makes clear that students with temporary disabilities are always entitled to services, but it would restrict their inclusion in the headcount for funding purposes to situations where they have received services on several occasions over a period of time. This will tend to reduce distortions of funding which would result from students making minimal use of available services. Moreover, this recommendation would have the additional benefit of eliminating from the headcount even those students with a permanent disability who receive only very limited services.

Students with Learning Disabilities

In recent years, the conviction has grown among educators that some students who have difficulty learning suffer from some sort of physical or neurological dysfunction that impairs their ability to learn. An example would be dyslexic students who have trouble reading because letters appear to be reversed. Presumably, students with a "learning disability" cannot be cured or assisted by ordinary remedial techniques and would, like other students with disabilities, need specialized support services in order to compensate for their disabilities. While this notion may be conceptually sound, its practical application has been plagued with problems.

The primary problem is that the actual physiological dysfunctions underlying learning disabilities have not yet been identified. Thus, definitions of "learning disability" have tended to be speculative and imprecise. The most popular approach has been to define learning disability by saying what it is not, so that persons with learning disabilities are those who show marked discrepancies between potential and achievement which cannot be attributed to some other cause. Indeed, the Statewide Task Force defined learning disability as "specific learning disabilities are disorders in which the individual's ability to process language, read, spell, and/or calculate is significantly below expectancy as measured by an appropriate professional or agency despite conventional instruction, adequate intelligence, and sociocultural opportunity . . . " (1979, p. 4).

While this type of definition may be conceptually useful, it merely assumes the existence of physiological causes and is incapable of distinguishing persons whose learning problems are or may be physiologically caused from those whose problems stem from some other unknown cause.

Moreover, there may well be students with very real learning disabilities who have also been affected by educational or environmental factors, and who would be excluded by a strict application of the definition.

A secondary problem is the lack of standardized assessment methods. Being unable to identify specific physiological dysfunctions, practitioners have resorted to measuring students' performance on various psychometric and achievement tests. However, there is currently no set battery of tests nor any criteria for what test results will suffice to place a given student in the learning disabled category.

The inadequacy of these definitions has resulted in wide disparities in the estimates of the learning disabled population. Some argue that learning disabilities do not exist or are extremely rare, while others estimate that large numbers may be classified as learning disabled (Hobbs, 1975, pp. 79-82). This would be no more than a mildly interesting academic argument except that the availability of specialized assistance and increased funding may depend on the determination of whether or not there exists a disability underlying a student's learning problem.

This definitional confusion also poses several significant problems for programs designed to serve the learning disabled. First, since medical verification is difficult or impossible, these programs have often been forced to develop their own identification and assessment standards and administer tests to students. Second, natural pressures exist for faculty and students to include students with learning problems in the learning disability program so that they can receive the specialized assistance which may not be available elsewhere on campus. And finally, these factors have resulted in rapidly increasing numbers of students and escalating costs at a time when State funding has been capped.

These problems also raise a number of significant policy issues. Ideally, a clear demarcation should exist between programs for the learning disabled and remedial programs for other students. However, after studying programs for students with learning problems, the Department of Finance concluded that in some cases students who were considered learning disabled at one campus would be placed in a regular remedial program at another campus. The Department's study was informal and does not indicate how prevalent these problems are, but it does suggest that there may be overlap and lack of clear delineation between these programs. During the Commission's study of remedial education in postsecondary education, Commission staff found during site visits that at some campuses the learning disability program was simply the lowest level of the remedial program into which students were placed who did not respond well to ordinary remedial techniques. Again, this is an even greater concern if, as is now the case, the level of State support is different for the two types of programs.

Another problem concerns the question of who should perform the assessment. Problems with medical verification of learning disability have led to the development of a new type of educational professional known as a "learning disability specialist." However, no uniform course of study and no certification process for such specialists yet exists, although the State University does offer a master's degree program for training

learning disabilities specialists. If, as an alternative to requiring medical verification of a learning disability, the State permits these specialists to perform the identification and assessment function, then ensuring their competency becomes even more vital.

Thus, while there is no question that students with "learning disabilities" should receive necessary support services, problems do exist about how such students are to be identified, who should identify them, and how programs for these students should be differentiated from those for other students with learning problems who are not disabled.

The Chancellor of the Community Colleges is currently conducting a study which is designed to resolve many of these problems. The study is being conducted in cooperation with the California Association of Postsecondary Educators of the Disabled and also involves a number of nationally recognized experts on learning disabilities who have been retained as consultants. The study team has operationally accepted a functional definition similar to that in the 1979 Task Force Report and has primarily concentrated on developing a battery of tests which will consistently distinguish those who meet the definition from those who do not. Although this approach will not address the underlying causation of "learning disability," it will provide a certain rough uniformity and delineation of function between remedial programs and programs for students with disabilities. By contrast, a group of researchers at CSU, Long Beach are working on identifying the physiological disfunctions which result in "learning disability" and report that they have isolated and often corrected specific visual or auditory problems in a large percentage of cases.

Those who study and work with students with "learning disabilities" may eventually reconcile these different techniques and develop a consistent method of identifying and assisting students with such problems. Meanwhile, the State should strive to settle on an operational approach which ensures that necessary services are available through some rational and consistent delivery system.

The Chancellor of the Community Colleges has limited further growth in learning disability programs until the study is completed, and the recommendation below would continue this policy at the Community Colleges and extend it to the University and State University until intersegmental agreement is reached on identification and assessment standards.

RECOMMENDATION 2. State funding for specialized tutoring and assessment for students with learning disabilities should be maintained at present levels through June 30, 1984, or until the results of the current study by the Chancellor of the Community Colleges are available and all three segments, in cooperation with the Commission, have agreed on equivalent definitions and general principles regarding verification and assessment of learning disabilities. The Community Colleges and State University should also discuss the training and qualifications of program staff working with students with learning disabilities, but the availability of funds shall not depend on agreement on this subject.

WHAT SERVICES SHOULD BE PROVIDED?

The AB 77 Model

As discussed earlier, Community College programs for students with disabilities were originally funded through statutes designed for special education in the public schools. In general, these statutes provided a district with a fixed amount per unit of ADA to provide services to students with a particular type of disability.

As time went on, programs were expanded to serve new groups of students and amendments were added to the funding statutes which authorized support at a specified rate for this new group. Eventually, separate programs with separate funding developed for each disability group. Not only was this system difficult to administer, it was inequitable and encouraged program managers to seek out and serve certain groups and underserve other groups, depending on the incentives for funding.

AB 77 was designed to simplify the funding system and eliminate its inequities. It created a special categorical fund from which Community Colleges may provide services for students with disabilities. The size of this fund is determined by multiplying a dollar figure of $12.19 per unit of ADA by the total number of units of ADA reported by the Chancellor for the Community Colleges as a whole. The size of the fund bears no relationship to the number of students with disabilities served or the costs of serving those students, except that it may not exceed $785 for each student with a disability and three times that amount for each severely disabled student.

Except in the most general terms, AB 77 did not define what type of services may be provided with these funds. Its underlying rationale was that Community College districts should not bear the burden of providing sometimes costly accommodations for students with disabilities from their regular budget. Thus, if districts incur costs for serving these students which exceed revenue from ADA and income from other sources, then the State would cover the difference from the AB 77 fund. This feature is referred to as "direct excess cost" funding. Using this system, the Community Colleges have developed a broad array of services for students with disabilities. Indeed, during 1980-81, they offered over 30 such services (listed in column 2 of Table 1) according to the Chancellor's 1981 report to the Legislature discussed in Part One of this report.

AB 77's funding system might be adequate if the amount of money available under the statute exceeds actual need. However, when overall ADA growth is slow or when, as in recent years, the Legislature imposes an arbitrary cap on funding levels, problems develop. Despite the capped allocation, the number of students served has continued to climb--from approximately 39,000 in 1979-80 to 51,000 in 1981-82. With no limitation on the types of services to be provided or the number of students to be served, the inevitable result is that services must be denied or there will be a gradual deterioration of the quality of services.

Since 1979, the Board of Governors has not used the funding approach described in AB 77 to determine the allocation of State funds to the Community Colleges. Instead, it has developed budget augmentation requests adjusted for workload changes and inflation. The Legislature has considered these on a case-by-case basis and made funds available to the Community Colleges by budget appropriations in lieu of the amounts which would have been generated under AB 77.

The 1979 Task Force Model

The 1979-80 Budget Act contained funding for programs for students with disabilities based on a formula providing $465 for each student to be served. This amount was a rough estimate of the per capita cost of serving students with disabilities in the Community Colleges in 1978-79. In hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, the three segments, the Commission, and the Department of Finance agreed to use this per capita formula on a temporary basis, with the understanding that the State would provide sufficient funds to ensure that every student would receive necessary services and that a permanent mechanism would be developed which more accurately reflected the actual cost of operating the programs.

Because of this limited funding, the Statewide Task Force, which was established by Supplemental Language in the 1979-80 Budget Act, developed the list of "core services" reproduced in Table 1 above, recommended that campuses be allowed to use other resources to supplement these minimal services, and left open the possibility that State funding for additional services might become available. In addition, it reiterated the State's commitment to cover the actual cost of providing necessary services, and called for the development of a long-term funding mechanism based on experience gained from operation of the programs during 1979-80.

The basic difference between the Task Force approach and that established by AB 77 involves the way in which State obligations are defined and limited. The Task Force recommended that the State fully fund a defined set of services which should be available everywhere, while AB 77 provides a fixed amount of State support to offset the "excess costs" resulting from providing whatever services a particular college or district might choose to offer. The Task Force model affirms the value of equity in the provision of essential services to students with similar disabilities regardless of the institution they attend, while AB 77 stressed flexibility to meet needs that may vary between institutions and disability groups. These approaches could be compatible if State funding were available in sufficient quantity to support a base level of service as well as the opportunity for local adaptation. Because this has not been the case, controversy has arisen over the appropriate use of the limited funds which are available. Some Community College programs operating under the "excess cost" model of AB 77 have expanded to provide a broad range of services, while others have had difficulty in providing even the core services described in the Task Force Report. By contrast to the extensive programs at some Community Colleges, the University's and State University's programs have been restricted to the core services and have been forced to rely on student fees and other revenues because the State has never fully funded the programs.

The Task Force guidelines are based on the philosophy that, whenever possible, students with disabilities should be served by programs serving all students and that the function of the special program for students with disabilities should be to coordinate these resources, ensure that they are accessible to the disabled, and supplement them with necessary services which are not otherwise available. As a result of this philosophy, a number of services generally available to all students, such as outreach, transportation, counseling, tutoring, and career planning and placement, are not specifically listed as core services in the Task Force report. However, practical problems often arise in making these generic services, which serve all students, accessible to students with disabilities, and on many campuses, separate transportation, tutoring, and outreach services have become part of the program for these students. These services are funded by AB 77 in the Community Colleges and in some instances by other sources at the University and State University. The Task Force report contains language permitting the programs to provide services necessary to facilitate access, but it is unclear whether this justifies duplicative services if access cannot easily be ensured in any other fashion.

Another difference between AB 77 and the model described in the Task Force report is that AB 77 funds may be used to offset the excess cost of specialized instruction, while the Task Force guidelines refer only to support services. Although the 1978 State Plan recognized that some students may want or need special classes, the funds made available in 1979 and the scope of the Task Force Report guidelines were limited to support services. This has not proven to be a serious problem for the University and State University where such classes are rare, but it has been a major issue for the Community Colleges, and will be explored further in Part Three.

The 1981 Commission Model

The Statewide Task Force asked the segments to submit to the Department of Finance by February 1980 information about the number of students with disabilities served by their programs and the actual cost of serving these students. These data demonstrated that enrollments had exceeded expectations at the State University and the Community Colleges and that costs had exceeded expectations at the University. Late in the year, the budget for the State University was augmented, but those of the Community Colleges and University were not. Moreover, since no long-term funding mechanism for programs serving students with disabilities had been developed by Spring 1980, the Legislature did not appropriate any additional funds for them beyond modest cost-of-living adjustments. Instead, it directed the Chancellor of the Community Colleges to study a number of issues related to the funding and operation of the programs, including those which were discussed in the previous section involving the types of services to be provided. The Chancellor's report of February 1981 stopped short of making recommendations concerning a long-term funding model, but it analyzed many significant issues and it provided a basis for further discussion between the segments and the Commission. In April 1981, segmental and Commission staffs reached tentative agreement in principle on several of these issues, and the Commission staff presented a funding

model based on these discussions to the fiscal committees of the Legislature in May.

This model was a compromise between the open-ended AB 77 system and the more restrictive approach spelled out in the 1979 Task Force report. It defined more clearly the core services to be provided at each campus and proposed a procedure by which each segment could develop a list of additional services required by its students and seek increased State support to provide these services. Under this model, funding was based on an average cost per student for providing a particular service, multiplied by the estimated number of students who would use that service. Certain expensive services such as readers, interpreters, and provision of adaptive equipment were handled separately, while other less costly services were grouped together. The model also separated funding for support services from that for specialized instruction at the Community Colleges but left open the question of how instruction would actually be funded.

Because this model was developed under the pressures of the budget process, it did not address many details involved in implementing the new funding mechanism. At the strong urging of the Department of Finance, the Legislature deferred action on the long-term funding mechanism and asked the Department to develop recommendations on the subject.

The Department of Finance Report

During the summer of 1981, staff of the Department of Finance visited a number of programs serving students with disabilities in all three segments and asked the segments to provide information on the numbers of students served and the costs of providing the services. In addition, after further work with the segments, Commission staff submitted to the Department a refined version of the funding model (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1981) which had been presented to the Legislature in the spring.

The resulting report, which the Department submitted to the Legislature early in 1982, did not propose a long-term funding mechanism as such, but it did make several specific recommendations which would have substantially affected programs serving students with disabilities. Its recommendations retained much of the structure of the 1979 Task Force report, but some services, such as outreach and transportation, were expressly excluded while counseling and tutoring were permitted under limited circumstances. It recommended continuation of the per-capita funding system but would have established different funding levels at each segment. It argued that student registration fees should not be used to support programs for students with disabilities at the University, and it recommended an augmentation of $156,000 in State funds to offset this proposed change. It also recommended that special classes at Community Colleges not receive additional funding beyond the regular ADA generated by the class. Eliminating funding for transportation and special classes would have resulted in a reduction of $6.25 million in the budget for programs serving students with disabilities in the Community Colleges.

The Department of Finance did not complete the report in time for its recommendations to be reflected in the Governor's 1982-83 Budget, and so the Legislature did not take action on them. As a result, several important questions remain unresolved regarding the type of services which should be provided and how they should be funded.

Program Purpose

Underlying questions about the type of services to be offered is the issue of the purpose of programs for students with disabilities. In general, there are three successively more expansive ways in which the obligations of the educational institution to persons with disabilities may be defined.

1. The institution must refrain from discrimination based solely on the basis of disability.

2. The institution must ensure that programs and activities which are offered to all students are also accessible to and usable by otherwise qualified persons with disabilities. This can be accomplished by modifying facilities, providing auxilary aids, or making minor non-substantive modifications in the programs themselves.

3. The institution must, in addition to 1 and 2 above, take steps to eliminate the underrepresentation of students with disabilities by conducting special outreach, developing new programs designed to meet the needs and interests of these students, and providing specialized assistance to such students to compensate for emotional or educational deficits resulting from their disability.

Taken together, the regulations adopted by HEW and the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Southeastern Community College vs. Davis have interpreted Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 in a manner equivalent to the second of these three levels of obligation.

However, while the obligations of the institution under federal law are fairly clear, the State has not been as clear as to its policy on this subject. In ACR 201, the Legisalture asked each of the segments to prepare plans to eliminate the underrepresentation of students with disabilities. These plans were developed and consolidated in the 1978 State Plan. Given the authority and funding of AB 77, the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges adopted program regulations which implement these plans and define for Community Colleges goals corresponding to the third of these three approaches.

But, by 1979, the State's fiscal situation had worsened and the funding allocated to the University and State University that year was subject to the Task Force guidelines which more closely resemble the narrower approach of the second paragraph. The intent of the Legislature has been further obscurred because, although AB 77 and its associated regulations are still technically in effect, budget allocations since 1979 have been based on budget augmentation requests as described earlier. Thus, all three segments stand ready to proceed with plans to operate broadly

defined programs, but only the Community Colleges have been given authority to use State funds to implement these plans and even in that segment funding practices have not followed the statutory provisions in recent years. In his February 1981 report to the Legislature, the Chancellor of the Community Colleges argued that the use of special classes and the broader range of services offered by the Community Colleges are justified because (a) Community College programs serve a wider variety of students; (b) their students tend to be more severely disabled; and (c) these students often have more serious educational deficits than do those at the University and State University.

As the first of these arguments suggests, it is reasonable to expect Community Colleges to offer different types of services if they serve different types of students. This is most clearly illustrated in the case of special classes and services provided by Community Colleges to students with developmental disabilities who are not served by programs at the University and State University. It is also true, as mentioned earlier, that the Community Colleges serve a much larger number of students with learning disabilities, but serving more of these students merely justifies delivery of more services and not necessarily different ones.

The second and third arguments of the Chancellor explain why Community Colleges offer special classes and a broader range of services than other segments to students with physical, communication, or learning disabilities who are served by all three segments. However, neither the severity of students' disabilities or their educational deficits can adequately justify existing Community College programs. Both able-bodied and disabled students may have educational deficits, so the fact that a student has such a deficit does not, by itself, justify specialized services, although it would justify the student's involvement in the college's regular remedial program. Similarly, many students with disabilities at the University and State University may be just as severely disabled as those at the Community Colleges, so the severity of disability is not what results in the need for additional services.

The real problem faced by the Community Colleges is that without the natural screening mechanism of academic admission requirements that exist at the other two segments, the Community Colleges find themselves serving many students with disabilities who are less independent, have fewer coping skills, and because of past discrimination and segregation may have been poorly educated or socialized. Although these conditions are often associated with disability, they are not inherent to being disabled, since many persons with disabilities can and do avoid or overcome them.

A policy similar to that described in the second numbered paragraph above requires only that an institution offer services and make non-substantive changes in its programs that would be necessary to accommodate the inherent limitations imposed by disability. Such a policy would not require the institution to offer services or programs designed to compensate for the personal, social, or educational limitations that are often, but not necessarily, associated with disability. This approach assumes that other agencies or the individual student will deal with overcoming these secondary effects of disability. By contrast, an institution which operates under a policy like the third above would take responsibility

for assisting the student to cope with the full spectrum of functional limitations which are associated with a disability.

Obviously, State policy on this issue should be equitable and uniform before rational decisions can be made about what services should be available at State expense to students with disabilities.

> RECOMMENDATION 3. The Legislature should clarify State policy to indicate that the purposes of programs for students with disabilities are: (1) to provide services necessary to permit students with disabilities to participate in the educational programs operated by the institutions they attend, and (2) to increase the representation of these students. Priority for State funding shall be given to the first of these objectives, and funding shall be made available for outreach, additional specialized programs, and compensatory services when this initial objective has been achieved at all institutions.

Integration of Services

Another policy problem is the integration of services. Both AB 77 and the 1979 Task Force report stress the need to integrate services for students with disabilities to the greatest degree possible. Ideally, each office on campus which provides a service to students would be capable of making its services accessible to students with disabilities. The primary function of the program for students with disabilities should be to coordinate and facilitate such services and to provide services which are not otherwise available. This would give students with disabilities the greatest freedom to pursue any educational program, take advantage of all services offered to students, and be treated as much as possible like other students.

In practice, however, this ideal level of integration is often difficult if not impossible to achieve. Sometimes physical barriers make it impossible for students with disabilities to be served by the same office which serves other students. In other cases, attitudinal or administrative barriers remain. Finally, when funding is restricted, no program is likely to be anxious to take on the responsibility for serving additional students, especially if serving those students will be difficult or costly.

Faced with these obstacles, programs for students with disabilities on some campuses have themselves taken on the responsibility for providing counseling, tutoring, and other services which may be available elsewhere on campus. This ensures that students with disabilities receive necessary services, but as is often the case with many categorical programs, it may reinforce the tendency of other programs to avoid their responsibility for providing services which are accessible to the disabled. If the State provides funds to serve these students through a separate program for students with disabilities, services will naturally be offered through this program rather than depleting the limited resources of other programs. Thus the short-term solution of separate services is antithetical to achieving the long-term goal of integrated services. Yet it is surely

inappropriate to ask students with disabilities to wait to receive needed services until some time in the future when the barriers to completely integrated service delivery can be overcome.

There is no easy way out of this dilemma. No simple rule can be devised for determining when the obstacles to integration are so numerous and formidable that it is necessary to resort to provision of separate services. There are also some instances in which students prefer separate services and find them beneficial. At the best, State policy can attempt to encourage eventual integration while ensuring that necessary services are available at all times. Recommendation 4 below attempts to further this objective by requiring that if the State funds counseling, tutoring, outreach, or off-campus transportation, these services will be delivered through programs serving all students where such programs exist. It also requires that such services be coordinated by the program for students with disabilities and that services be provided by qualified staff, with institutions having the option of retraining staff currently working in the regular campus programs, hiring new staff trained to work with students with disabilities, or moving existing staff from the program for students with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 4. In the event that any segment receives State funding pursuant to Recommendations 8 and 9 below to provide outreach, disability related counseling, specialized tutoring, or off-campus transportation, such funding shall be coordinated through programs serving students with disabilities, but services should be delivered by qualified staff through programs providing similar services to all students, where such programs exist.

RECOMMENDATION 5. The Legislature should direct the Department of Transportation, working with all three segments and the Commission, to develop, by January 1, 1984, a plan for ensuring that all public transit agencies in the State are capable of providing off-campus transportation to students with disabilities within their jurisdiction by July 1, 1986. This plan should include provisions requiring local transit operators to work with programs serving students with disabilities to implement the transfer of services at the local level, and the Department of Transportation should, by April 1, 1986, report to the Legislature on its readiness to implement the plan statewide by July 1, 1986. Programs serving students with disabilities shall not receive State funds to provide off-campus transportation after July 1, 1986, except in those areas where no public transit agency exists or where the plan developed pursuant to this recommendation has not been adequately implemented.

HOW SHOULD THESE SERVICES BE FUNDED?

Present Funding Mechanisms

As discussed earlier, AB 77 provides a funding system for the Community Colleges which reimburses districts for the costs of serving students with disabilities to the extent that those costs exceed revenue from ADA. The total amount available is determined by a formula based on the aggregate ADA for the Community Colleges as a whole. In recent years, this entire mechanism has been replaced by a series of annual "in lieu" appropriations.

In contrast, the University and State University programs are funded at a fixed per-capita rate which is multiplied by the number of students with disabilities receiving services. This formula has the virtue of being somewhat more responsive to increased need, but the per-capita rate was developed based on scanty information and bears little relation to the true costs of providing the services.

The model which Commission staff submitted to the Department of Finance in September 1981, which was based on tentative agreement reached with representatives of the three segments, provides a sound foundation for a long-term funding mechanism. Under this model, funding would be based on an average cost per student for each service, at least for those services which are particularly expensive to provide. Certain services listed in Appendix A would be available at every institution of public postsecondary education. Each segment would also have the opportunity to develop a list including additional services for which State funding could be requested. This approach offers greater flexibility than does the 1979 Task Force Report, and it accomplishes the goal of ensuring that basic services are available throughout the State in a way which AB 77 does not. This system is also more sensitive to changes in student demand, at least for the high-cost services where such changes are most likely to cause disruption in a flat-rate system.

One problem with this model is that it does not adequately address the issues discussed in the previous section regarding which services should be provided. The 1981 model does suggest funding certain services and permitting each segment to request funding for additional services. While this is necessary to give flexibility, it merely defers decisions regarding the State's willingness and ability to fund certain services about which questions have already been raised. Those services which are currently at issue are counseling, tutoring, outreach, and transportation. As indicated earlier, whether such services should be provided depends upon the defined purpose of the program and the degree to which integration of services is desirable and feasible. Recommendation 3 attempts to define State policy on these issues, and any funding mechanism must be designed to support these policies.

Future Funding Principles

The other issue which the 1981 model did not address was the proper funding level. Since 1979, the State has been committed to fully funding

the provision of necessary services to students with disabilities. The allocation for 1979-80 was based on the temporary $465-per-student formula, with the understanding that a long-term funding mechanism would soon be developed. All subsequent efforts to accomplish this have been hampered by the fact that this per-capita formula provided insufficient funding and distorted reporting of the true cost of operating these programs.

The 1979 allocations to the segments were largely arbitrary and did not bear any real relation to the cost of adequately providing necessary services. Thus when the segments reported the costs for providing services during 1979-80, the figures bore no real relationship to need since they were really only reflections of the amounts received. Since that time, budgets have simply been adjusted for cost-of-living increases, with the exception of a small augmentation for the transfer of services from the Department of Rehabilitation in 1981. Thus all costs reported since 1979 are affected by the arbitrary nature of the initial allocations.

It is true that each of the segments has supplemented State funding with other resources, but the presence of these additional funds does not avoid the difficulties in determining accurate costs, except perhaps at the University. The University supplemented the State funds with federal grants, Regents' funds, and student registration fee funds. The other resources available to the State University are not as substantial as those at the University given the relative size of the program budgets, and at the Community Colleges much of the additional funding comes from revenue from ADA in special classes and does not apply to the provision of support services.

Another problem involved in determining appropriate funding levels is that the costs of providing support services vary among the segments for a number of reasons:

- First, salaries and other operating expenses may be different for the University than for the State University and the Community Colleges.

- Second, costs per student would be expected to be higher at the University than at the State University and the Community Colleges because the University serves a comparatively small number of students with disabilities, and economies of scale are not as feasible.

- Third, the types of students served and the services offered are considerably different, at least when the University and State University are compared to the Community Colleges. While costs for providing the same services to the same student population may be roughly comparable, present data-collection techniques do not permit a detailed breakdown of costs for the Community Colleges.

- Fourth and finally, the students at the University and the State University usually attend full time and receive individual services, while those at the Community Colleges average approximately half time and may receive services in a group setting, and, therefore, presumably cost somewhat less to serve per individual.

Despite these differences, the University's cost per student data probably at least provide an upper limit on what programs at the State University and Community Colleges might reasonably be expected to cost.

Because the long-term funding mechanism recommended in 1981 is based on the concept of an average cost per student for certain types of services, if this model is adopted, some method must be devised to develop estimates of the average cost of providing given services that overcomes the inherent inadequacies and historical inequities of the cost information currently available. One method might be to fund programs at an artificially high level and allow them to operate for a specified period of time in order to establish true costs without the constraint of limited funding. Apart from the fiscal arguments against allocating larger than necessary amounts to a particular program, the difficulty with this method is that costs will naturally tend to rise to the level of available funding. A second approach would be to have a group of knowledgeable practitioners develop reasonable cost rates based on their experience. Such estimates might be high, but they could be balanced against historical cost figures to compensate for this tendency.

Accordingly, the following principles, which represent a refinement of the model developed in 1981, are recommended as the basis of a long-term funding mechanism for programs serving students with disabilities:

RECOMMENDATION 6. The Legislature should fund the actual additional cost of providing necessary support services to students with disabilities in public postsecondary education

6.1 In determining the allocation of State funds for this purpose, the process described in Recommendations 7 through 12 below should be utilized.

6.2 Institutions should continue to utilize all other available resources to support programs for students with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 7. The Legislature should base funding of programs for students with disabilities in public postsecondary education on projections of costs submitted by each segment during the State budget process, except that costs for providing special classes in Community Colleges shall be funded in accordance with Recommendations 18-22 below. Initial cost projections shall be developed in accordance with Recommendation 12 below and projections for subsequent years should account for anticipated changes due to inflation, workload, and alterations in the program structure. Projections of workload increase should be based on actual increases experienced by the segment in prior years. Requests for increased support based on these projections shall be handled through the regular State budget process. The level of funding may vary between segments because of differences in the actual cost of adequately providing the same services in the three segments.

RECOMMENDATION 8. Each segment submit to the Department of Finance a budget request indicating State funds required to provide services to students with disabilities. Those services listed in Appendix A shall be available at each college or campus and shall be funded by the State. It is expressly recognized that services in addition to those listed in Appendix A are not necessarily of lesser priority. Once a service has been approved for State funding, it shall become a permanent part of the range of services to be provided by that segment, and the costs of providing such services shall be projected, reported, and funded as described in Recommendation 11 below.

RECOMMENDATION 9. Support services funded by the State shall be consistent with the following:

a. The service is consistent with the stated purposes of programs for students with disabilities as set forth in Recommendation 3.

b. The service does not duplicate services which are otherwise available to all students.

c. The need for the service is directly related to verifiable disabilities of the students to be served.

d. The need for the service is directly related to the person's participation in the educational process.

e. Services should have as their goals mainstreaming, independence, and/or maximum integration of students with disabilities.

f. Services should be provided in the most integrated setting possible consistent with State and federal law, State policy and funding requirements, and segmental missions and policies.

RECOMMENDATION 10. The Legislature should give each segment the discretionary authority to establish a Special Contingency Fund from the funds allocated in accord with Recommendation 11 below. The Special Contingency Fund shall be used for: (a) providing services to students who require services which are extraordinarily costly; and (b) providing inservice training to regular campus faculty and staff to improve their awareness of the needs of students with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 11. The Legislature should fund programs based on budget requests that add together the total cost for interpreters, readers, notetakers, special equipment, mobility assistance, other support services, administration, and the Special Contingency Fund, if any. In each category, the total

cost shall be determined by multiplying the number of students to be served by the estimated cost per student of providing the service or services. The estimated cost per student may be derived by the use of any formula, method, or process which the segment may select, so long as the method accurately reflects the true cost of adequately providing these services. (Appendix B contains the budget projection format.)

11.1 Notwithstanding the above budget projection system, the allocation to the segment shall be considered to be a lump sum and may be allocated to campuses or colleges by any reasonable and equitable method developed by the segments, provided, however, that all services listed in Appendix A must be available on each campus and the use of these funds is expressly restricted to the provision of support services for students with disabilities.

11.2 As used above, "administration" means the cost of ensuring compliance with these policies and guidelines in programs supported by funds provided under this policy. Costs of administration which are incurred at the campus or college level and at the systemwide level should be combined and reported under administration. Administration may include costs for program development, accountability, and evaluation as well as the costs associated with the operation of advisory committees described in Recommendations 13.1 and 13.2.

11.3 By November 1 of each year, each segment will report to the Department of Finance on forms to be developed jointly by the Commission, the segments, and the Department regarding the actual cost of program operation during the previous fiscal year. These reports shall include the numbers of students served and the costs of serving such students for each of the categories listed above. The report shall also include a breakdown of expenditures from the Special Contingency Fund. The report shall include information on the numbers of students served in each of the disability categories specified in Appendix C, and for the Community Colleges, the developmentally disabled should be separately reported.

11.4 Except as specifically superseded herein, the guidelines set forth in the attached 1979 Task Force report remain effective.

RECOMMENDATION 12. The Legislature should require that the initial average cost rates described in Recommendation 7 be established through the following process:

12.1 The Commission, with the advice of the Statewide Advisory Committee described in Recommendation 13 below, shall by October 1, 1983, review standards for reasonable levels of State support for the provision of services to students with disabilities and the administration of those services as developed by the three segments. Proposed funding levels shall be reviewed by the

Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance through the regular State budget process and shall serve as the basis of budgeting for the 1984-85 fiscal year.

12.2 Estimates of the average cost for providing a given service or services shall be based on the reasonably expected cost of providing a unit of service to a particular student and shall take into account the frequency with which students are likely to use the service.

12.3 Average cost rates may take into account differences between the segments and may deviate from historical cost figures. However, any deviations from such figures shall be based on specific justifications. In no event may aggregate per capita costs in any segment exceed those for the University of California.

12.4 Modifications in these initial average cost rates shall be made in accord with Recommendation 7 above.

HOW SHOULD PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES BE EVALUATED?

Although programs for students with disabilities have been the subject of numerous studies, little attention has been devoted to their systematic evaluation. This fact is due largely to their lack of clarity of purpose.

If they are designed to overcome underrepresentation and promote the recruitment and retention of students with disabilities, then their performance should be measured in terms of their ability to influence positively the representation of such students in the student body and their impact on the academic performance of these students. However, if their primary objective is merely to ensure accessibility, criteria for appropriate evaluation are less obvious. Student performance information might be considered irrelevant because the programs could fulfill their goal of ensuring accessibility despite students' possible failure or withdrawal for unrelated reasons. Likewise, monitoring changes in enrollment is a poor basis for evaluation because increases, or lack thereof, in the enrollment of students with disabilities is irrelevant if increasing enrollments is not a purpose of the program.

The most obviously appropriate measure would be student satisfaction, and it was for this reason that the 1979 Statewide Task Force recommended the establishment of advisory committees including student representatives who could presumably make known serious inadequacies in the programs. But even where such advisory committees do exist, they often do not meet regularly or do not have effective student representation. Surveys of students are helpful, but their results are often imprecise and easily biased.

At the request of the Legislature, the Chancellor of the Community Colleges is currently studying methods of evaluating the programs for students with disabilities. His study is focusing on the evaluation of classes providing specialized instruction for these students in the Community Colleges, but his report may include some recommendations applicable to evaluating all services in all three segments.

Although the results of the Chancellor's study are still pending, it is possible to make the following two recommendations. Commission staff will also take steps to establish a Statewide Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities to assist staff in a variety of areas including the review of program evaluations conducted by the segments.

RECOMMENDATION 13. Programs for students with disabilities shall include advisory committees as follows:

13.1 The Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should require that each campus establish an advisory committee on services to students with disabilities that shall meet regularly to review the operation of these programs. This committee should be advisory to the chief administrative officer of the campus. The committee should have substantial representation of students, faculty, and staff who are representative of as wide a variety of disabilities as possible and may also include representatives of appropriate community or State agencies, consumer groups, and any other appropriate organizations or individuals. Functions of the committee should include assisting in the evaluation of current campus policies and procedures relating to students with disabilities; developing plans for programs and services for these students; and setting priorities, developing timelines, and assisting in the estimation of costs associated with support services.

13.2 The Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should each establish a systemwide advisory committee on services to students with disabilities that shall meet regularly to review the operation of these programs. These committees should be advisory to and recognized by the chief administrative officer of each segment. These committees should have substantial representation of students, faculty, and staff who are representative of as wide a variety of disabilities as possible and may also include representatives of appropriate community or State agencies, consumer groups, and any other appropriate organizations or individuals. Functions of the committees should include assisting in the implementation and evaluation of programs for services to students with disabilities; developing proposals as necessary for the revision of systemwide policies for these students; and advising the systemwide administration on their needs and concerns.

RECOMMENDATION 14. Each segment should develop and submit to the Commission for its review by January 1, 1984, program evaluation standards which it will use in conducting evaluations of its programs for students with disabilities. The Commission with the advice of the Statewide Advisory Committee described in Recommendation 13.3 shall review and comment on these standards by April 1, 1984. At a minimum, the program evaluation process shall include periodic site visits or program audits by each systemwide administration and assessment of student satisfaction. Results of program evaluations should be included by each segment in their biennial report to the Commission, and the Commission shall review and comment on these reports to the respective segments. The Commission shall, by January 1, 1987, prepare a report which includes a comprehensive review of these programs based on the biennial reports called for by the 1979 Task Force report, information from the Statewide Advisory Committee, and program evaluations conducted by the segments in accordance with standards described in this recommendation and Recommendation 13.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE EFFECT OF THE TRANSFER OF SERVICES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION?

As mentioned above, until recently, the Department of Rehabilitation provided several important support services, including readers, interpreters, and note-takers, to its clients who were students in public postsecondary education. In 1979, however, based on its interpretation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and other provisions of federal and State law, the Department took the position that postsecondary educational institutions should bear this responsibility.

Since 1976, the Community Colleges have provided these services to their students who were not clients of the Department through funding under AB 77. The 1979 Statewide Task Force recognized that these services should be available at all institutions, and recommended that programs for students with disabilities should be funded to provide such services in the event that they were discontinued by the Department. In order to give the educational sector time to prepare for the transfer of responsibility for these services, the Department agreed to continue providing them for its clients through the academic year 1980-81. However, on July 1, 1981, the Department ceased providing these services, and the passage of SB 1053 two months later formally accomplished their transfer to postsecondary education.

Many groups, particularly organizations representing the blind, have expressed serious reservations about the ability of programs for students with disabilities to provide services as effectively as did the Department of Rehabilitation. In response to these concerns, SB 1053 contained language requiring each of the three segments to develop regulations by January 1982 to ensure that the quality of their services is equivalent to that previously provided by the Department. However, lack of sufficient

funding has made the institutions reluctant to adopt rules committing themselves to a particular quality or quantity of services, and thus these regulations have not yet been adopted, though the University maintains that its guidelines developed pursuant to the 1979 Task Force report satisfy the requirements of SB 1053.

The lack of these regulations means that no specific standards are available to measure performance nor is there a formal process by which students can resolve problems except for the regular campus appeals process. Thus little hard evidence exists on which to judge the effects of the transfer. Nonetheless, it was clear to the Department of Finance during its study that the programs have received inadequate funding from the State to provide for these additional services. Many campuses have found it necessary to restrict the hours that readers or interpreters are available or to rely heavily on volunteers. This problem remains most acute at the Community Colleges, but programs at the University might well have experienced similar difficulties if other resources had not been available, and some programs at State University campuses experienced severe difficulties in 1981 until these campuses gained experience in delivering these services.

Estimating the amount needed to offer these additional services adequately is very difficult. One problem is that campuses have tended to sacrifice the quality of services in order to stretch limited dollars to serve all students. Therefore, their costs are artificially low compared to what they would be if the services were provided in strict accord with SB 1053. Another problem is that clients of the Department of Rehabilitation who were students prior to July 1981 often received services from both the Department and campus programs. Thus, they already appeared in the segmental headcount, but they now need the additional services from the segments that previously were provided by the Department. This makes segmental costs of serving them even higher, but the present per-capita funding mechanism is incapable of accounting for substantial increases in the costs of serving existing students. It is likely that clients of the Department will be particularly costly to serve because they tend to be more severely disabled, and yet the Department of Rehabilitation, which presumably has experience in this area, has been unable to provide accurate information about the numbers of its clients in public postsecondary education or the costs of serving them.

RECOMMENDATION 15. In developing average cost rates pursuant to Recommendation 12, cost increases which may be attributable to the transfer of services from the Department of Rehabilitation shall be included.

Other problems have arisen because some campuses are uncertain about the implications of providing services to students with disabilities in the same fashion previously used by the Department of Rehabilitation. Under the Department, students were given the right to select, hire, and fire those persons who provided reader, interpreter, or other services to them. The student and the service provider determined when, where, and under what conditions the provider would work and completed a form which

they submitted to the Department to verify the number of hours worked. The Department then paid the service provider as an independent contractor. Most students deem this system essential because it gives them the flexibility to study in the most efficient way and to work with providers who are selected to their specifications. But such a system does not mesh well with traditional personnel practices of educational institutions. Moreover, many Community College administrators fear liability problems if they permit employees to work off campus without the supervision of district personnel. Although the University, with more flexible hiring procedures, has apparently had little difficulty in this regard, problems have occurred in the Community Colleges and the State University

RECOMMENDATION 16. The Education Code should be amended to indicate that the Community Colleges and the State University may elect to provide direct support services (principally reader and interpreter services) through an independent contractor system.

16.1 Such a system should permit students to select, hire, and fire those who provide services to them and make the student responsible for determining how, when, and where to work with the service provider. Students would be allotted a fixed number of dollars or hours of service which could be exceeded only with special approval.

16.2 In the event that a segment chooses not to use the independent contractor system, it must provide such services in accord with the guidelines of the 1979 Task Force report and the requirements of SB 1053.

The Commission will work with all three segments to ensure the greatest possible degree of uniformity in the delivery of services consistent with this recommendation and SB 1053. Finally, the lack of any formal process for resolving problems with the delivery of these services has hampered efforts to improve the quality of the services and to accurately assess the costs involved. An informal process has been devised whereby program staff and rehabilitation counselors attempt to resolve problems at the local level. If they are unsuccessful, then representatives of systemwide administration and the Department's central office staff attempt to reach agreement with the assistance of Commission staff if necessary. The Department has also agreed to provide services in the event that lack of funds or other insurmountable problems made it impossible for the educational institution to assist a particular student.

These informal arrangements have not been entirely satisfactory, however. Many students, counselors, and program-level staff have been unaware of them or have found them confusing and ineffectual. As a result, only a limited number of appeals have reached the systemwide level, and in only one case has Commission staff become involved. Theoretically, these results might indicate that the programs are performing satisfactorily, but feedback from consumer groups indicates that problems continue to be widespread, particularly in the Community Colleges. This suggests that the monitoring process itself is inadequate.

RECOMMENDATION 17. Programs for students with disabilities should provide the support services listed in Appendix A and any other services which may be developed in accord with the recommendations of this report. The Legislature should direct the Department of Rehabilitation to provide all other support services which may be necessary to assist its clients who may be students in public postsecondary education. The Legislature should further direct the Department to work with the three segments and the Commission to develop a system for coordinating services and resolving problems which may arise so that students receive all necessary services. Such procedures should be in place by July 1, 1983.

THREE

ISSUES RELATED TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Almost from their inception, the Community Colleges assumed the responsibility for providing vocational and technical education, awarding the associate degree, offering the first two years of undergraduate education to students who then transfer to obtain a bachelor's degree at a four-year institution, and providing community service activities. Commensurate with these broad functions, the Community Colleges operate on the open admission system under which any adult who can benefit from instruction is admissible without regard to previous academic attainment.

Given their efforts to serve the entire community, it is not surprising that the Community Colleges have created programs which offer a wide range of services extending to even the most severely disabled. As discussed earlier, a number of services are provided beyond those available at the University or the State University, and, as Table 3 clearly shows, the students differ from those served by the other segments. The learning disabled comprise approximately 20 percent of the students with disabilities served by Community College programs, and these programs also serve large numbers of students with developmental disabilities.

In 1981-82, just over 4 percent of all Community College students were served by programs for students with disabilities. While this may not seem a high percentage, it is impressive when compared with the performance of many other institutions in assimilating persons with disabilities, especially in light of the fact that many of these students are severely disabled and often have not received appropriate education or training before entering a Community College program.

Thus the Community Colleges have been instrumental in expanding educational opportunities for persons with disabilities in California. This is an accomplishment which the Commission believes must be protected even if fiscal conditions worsen. The best way to do so is to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of these programs and to better coordinate Community College programs with those services provided by other agencies. The remainder of this report contains eight recommendations designed to achieve these improvements in effectiveness, coordination, and equity to ensure that changes do not result in any dimunition of services, loss of opportunities for advancement currently available to persons with disabilities, or exclusion of these persons from appropriate programs. There is no question that Community Colleges will continue to play a major part in the delivery of services to persons with disabilities. The question is rather how they can be most effective in providing services.

SPECIAL CLASSES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The role of the Community Colleges, together with ACR 201 can be interpreted to make these institutions responsible for seeking out and serving all persons with disabilities. Such a charge would require not only more extensive support services but also the modification of programs and curricula in order to meet the needs of these students. As discussed earlier in the section on program purpose, the Community Colleges have in fact adopted this practice and offer a wide range of "special classes" for students with disabilities.

At the extreme of this range of special classes some Community Colleges offer instruction in basic living skills and a few have programs for adults with developmental disabilities in State hospitals. The use of these special classes has assisted the Community Colleges in implementing ACR 201 and expanding opportunities for persons with disabilities. However, in recent years a number of questions have arisen about these class offerings in some districts. Three of these issues are discussed in the following pages and several general recommendations are offered for their resolution. Resolving these issues should make programs for students with disabilities more effective and ensure that services and instruction better meet student needs.

The first issue is how far the curriculum can be modified before it becomes duplicative of services provided by other agencies. There are no restrictions on what may be taught in a special class, and these classes do not always go through the regular curriculum development and approval process. Thus, virtually any activity which can be conducted in a group setting can be considered a special class and is eligible to receive excess cost funding to supplement the revenue from ADA.

The very presence of these classes is an indication that a need exists. However, presumably the purpose of these programs is to deliver postsecondary education to this population, and the special class system accomplishes this primarily by expanding the definition of postsecondary education to the point where it can encompass any service anyone needs. Postsecondary education is seen as the responsibility of the colleges, while other agencies should provide other services needed by persons with disabilities. However, due to the lack of a clear definition of education, and the pressures from other agencies with more limited resources, some colleges have expanded their range of activities to the point that it becomes difficult to distinguish the college from other social service agencies. Of course, postsecondary education as provided by a Community College is a much broader concept than traditional collegiate education, but some special classes raise questions as to what "postsecondary education" does mean.

Recommendation 18 below asks the Board of Governors to examine this issue and develop guidelines related to the purposes for which special classes can be used.

RECOMMENDATION 18. The Board of Governors of the Community Colleges should review existing regulations related to special classes for students with disabilities, consider the development of guidelines more clearly defining the purposes for which a special class may be offered, and explore methods of better coordinating programs offered by Community Colleges with services for persons with disabilities provided by other agencies.

A second related problem involves the statement in Section 66201 of the Education Code that students must have "the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education." In practice, the requirement that students be able to benefit from instruction usually does not operate to exclude anyone, and the Community Colleges are thus regarded as having an "open door" admission policy. However, some students with disabilities, particularly those adults with developmental disabilities, might prove unable to benefit from most regular Community College courses. (For a discussion of the term "developmental disability" see the text beginning on page 42. By the term "regular," the Commission means all classes other than special classes.) Although programs have occasionally been established to integrate adults with developmental disabilities into regular courses, the more common practice is to place them in special classes with modified curricula. This approach is thought to provide more appropriate instruction to most adults with developmental disabilities and to allow them to benefit from instruction.

If thus modifying the curriculum enables the developmentally disabled to benefit from instruction, then they are admissible to Community Colleges and are entitled to receive services from programs serving students with disabilities. But modifying curriculum to meet the particular needs of a group can, as discussed above, result in the institution offering something which is clearly a social service rather than education. Moreover, in some instances, it is not entirely clear that students actually progress or benefit from even this form of instruction, particularly since advocates of these programs argue that preventing a student from regressing as quickly as would otherwise be the case constitutes progress.

Recommendations 18-22 impose some limitations on special classes that will help to ensure that students in such classes have an opportunity to profit from the instruction they receive. Certainly many students with developmental disabilities could participate in and benefit from courses offered in accordance with the provisions of Recommendations 18-22, but others, particularly those in State hospitals and adult development centers, may not. This problem is addressed by Recommendation 24 below.

Third and finally, while special classes are successful at involving students with disabilities in a Community College program, they may not do much to truly normalize or mainstream these students. Most special classes are closed to non-disabled students and few of those which are open would be useful or of interest to the non-disabled. In addition, many Community Colleges offer special classes off campus in facilities which serve or house the disabled, and the disabled student never even meets a non-disabled Community College student. Of course, some of these students would never attend a Community College otherwise, and though the

fact that they are placed in segregated classes may be philosophically troublesome, but they are still better off than if they had received no education at all. It is also true that special classes held on campus may provide some opportunity for persons with disabilities to interact with the non-disabled outside of the classroom even where the class itself is segregated. One real danger is that in some cases students placed in segregated classes could have succeeded in regular classes with the appropriate support. This potential for success in regular courses can be increased by minor modifications in format, such as easing limits placed on the time required to complete the course or using programmed learning modules.

How many students would be willing and able to benefit from improved opportunities to participate in regular classes is unknown, but the current situation does not appear to promote mainstreaming. One possible reason for this is that financial incentives exist which induce districts to use special classes. In its 1980 request for a study of these programs by the Chancellor of the Community Colleges, the Legislature specifically asked whether financial incentives exist which induce districts to offer classes for the developmentally disabled. In his 1981 report, the Chancellor concluded that no such incentives existed because only a few districts had chosen to offer such programs and the student instructor ratios were comparable to those in all special classes. But this analysis, which compares classes for students with developmental disabilities to those for students with other disabilities, does not address the question of whether more general incentives are at work which encourage the use of special classes as opposed to placing a student in a regular class with support services.

Indeed, it appears that the present funding mechanism may do precisely this because it offers the possibility of generating revenue from ADA which can be used to stretch the limited dollars available in the AB 77 excess cost fund. Moreover, until this year, a district was permitted to charge any amount it wished as an indirect rate which was added to the actual cost of operating the class before calculating the excess cost to be charged to the State. Since there were no controls on the indirect rate, this mechanism held considerable potential for abuse. The Chancellor is currently developing regulations to deal with this particular problem.

But other, more basic reasons may account for the frequency with which special classes are used. Primary among them is the fact that integrating students with severe disabilities into regular classes is difficult, expensive, and requires the support and cooperation of the regular faculty who may be uncomfortable working with these students. Also, salaries for faculty are generally higher than those for staff so a built-in incentive exists for those who deliver the services to structure them as special classes for which they are the instructors. Thus, a number of factors other than the needs of students influence colleges to develop special classes rather than working to place students in regular classes.

Despite these difficulties, some special classes do serve a useful function: they provide a limited form of access to postsecondary education for some students with severe disabilities who would otherwise be entirely

excluded. While substantial modification of programs and curriculum is not required to provide program access under federal law [Southeastern Community College v. Davis, 442 U.S. 397 (1979)], the State's commitment to extending educational opportunities justifies such efforts. While integration of students with severe disabilities into regular classes may be feasible as a long-term objective, it is unlikely to be accomplished quickly, and in the interim, special classes do provide a mechanism for delivering education to this population.

In addition, some students, particularly the deaf, may prefer separate classes and would choose them even where regular classes were made accessible. Of course, some subjects not of use or interest to non-disabled students may be legitimately offered in classes for students with disabilities, since in these cases a sort of natural separation will occur even if the classes are open to all students.

> RECOMMENDATION 19. The Community Colleges should continue to offer special classes to students with disabilities, and the excess cost of providing these classes should continue to be funded by the State, but the Board of Governors should review Section 56002 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code and current efforts to monitor compliance with this section to ensure that special classes are offered only in those situations in which they constitute the most integrated setting possible or the clear preference of students. That is, the decision about whether a student takes a regular or special class should be based solely on educational need and student choice.

The circumstances under which special classes should be offered and the means by which they should be funded in order to achieve this objective are discussed in the following section.

HOW SHOULD SPECIAL CLASSES BE OPERATED AND FUNDED?

At the direction of the Legislature, the Chancellor's staff is now preparing to implement new data collection and program evaluation requirements for special classes. This system will provide a great deal of new information about the quality, scope, and effectiveness of special classes which may eventually help fine tune the operation and funding of these classes.

Although the data from this new reporting system will not begin to be available until 1984, some general recommendations can be made at this time:

> RECOMMENDATION 20 The Board of Governors of the Community Colleges should develop procedures specifically designed to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 56004 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code that students

make a voluntary and informed decision before enrolling in a special class. These procedures should include having the student sign a form stating that the alternatives to a special class placement have been described to them and that they have been offered the opportunity to enroll in regular classes with appropriate support services.

RECOMMENDATION 21. The Board of Governors of the Community Colleges should require that special classes that are offered for credit shall meet the same requirements for grading, course content, and course approval as do other credit courses. In addition, special classes with curriculum substantially similar to that of an existing regular class shall not be offered for credit unless the institution can make available appropriate support services to allow any student with a disability to enroll in any regular class offered for credit. Special classes offered for credit shall be funded using the direct excess cost mechanism with modifications for the control of indirect rate charges.

RECOMMENDATION 22. The Board of Governors of the Community Colleges should require that non-credit special classes be offered subject to the limitations of Recommendation 20 above, and that such courses shall be eligible for excess cost funding only after approval by the Chancellor in accord with the following:

a. Priority shall be given to those courses which promote independence and/or mainstreaming.

b. Funding shall be made available only in cases where providing instruction in a regular class with support services is not feasible or would not meet the needs of the students.

c. Funding made available shall not, when combined with revenue from ADA, exceed the true cost of offering the course.

HOW SHOULD THE STATE DELIVER EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO ADULTS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES?

In general, the term "developmental disability" refers to mental retardation or any other disabling condition which results from a disruption of the normal developmental process. Under federal law, a developmental disability is a condition arising before the age of 22 which impairs three or more major life functions (42 USC Section 6,000, et. seq.). The State uses a separate definition which identifies persons with developmental disabilities as those with epilepsy, cerebral palsy, autism, mental retardation, or any condition requiring services and treatment similar to those applied to mental retardation (Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code Section 4512).

Under these definitions, there are some 230,000 adults with developmental disabilities in California, many of whom live with their parents, in community facilities, or in institutional settings. Approximately 40,000 of these individuals are categorized as substantially handicapped and are registered clients of the Regional Centers operated by the Department of Developmental Services. The experience of those who serve this population clearly demonstrates that with appropriate training and education these individuals can often lead richer, more productive, and less dependent lives, and can sometimes live independently and secure competitive employment.

Both State and federal laws establish the right of children with developmental disabilities to a free and appropriate education. While adults with developmental disabilities have the right to participate in postsecondary education (as does any adult who can satisfy the requirements of the institution), there is no corresponding mandate to provide educational services to adults with developmental disabilities equivalent to those they received as children. Nevertheless, their disability does not change once they become adults and they often need continued services. The State hospitals and regional centers are generally unable to provide or purchase these services, and have turned to adult education programs operated by the Department of Education and the Community Colleges to provide education for these adults.

AB 77 contains no definition of developmental disability, but its definition of learning disability would include many of those covered by the State definition. But including persons with developmental disabilities in the learning disability category has caused considerable confusion, and the Chancellor of the Community Colleges is now considering recommending that the Board of Governors adopt new definitions of learning disabled and "developmentally limited learners." Under this new definition, developmentally limited learners would include those with mental retardation, autism, and other similar limitations. Thus, this new definition would clarify existing practice in the Community Colleges which regards cerebral palsy and epilepsy as physical or communication disabilities and restricts developmental disability to those conditions which involve some impairment of intellectual function. Although this approach does not parallel either the State or the federal definition, it appears to be a practical necessity for an educational institution where radically different services may be required by students in these two populations.

RECOMMENDATION 23. The Board of Governors of the Community Colleges should adopt a definition of "developmental disabilities" and should make modifications in sections 56020, 56022, and 56024, of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code to make the disability definitions in these sections consistent with those in Appendix C and the agreements described in Recommendation 2. Programs for students with disabilities in the Community Colleges should provide services only to those students satisfying these definitions and who are capable of meeting the requirements of Section 66201 of the Education Code. Special classes for students with developmental disabilities should be offered in accord with Recommendations 18 through 22 above except as provided in Recommendation 24 below.

Using the Community College definition, persons with developmental disabilities would not normally be regularly admissible at the University or State University, and thus do not appear among the types of students reportedly served by programs for students with disabilities in these segments. However, the Community Colleges report serving some 6,000 adults with developmental disabilities during 1981-82, out of a disabled student population of approximately 51,000. In addition, there are a large number of persons with developmental disabilities in some State hospitals who are served by programs at a few Community Colleges which do not claim excess cost funding under AB 77 and, therefore, do not report their enrollments to the Chancellor's Office as part of the number of students served by programs for students with disabilities.

As indicated in Recommendation 23, it is certainly desirable and permissible for Community Colleges to serve adults with developmental disabilities who can benefit from instruction (as required in Section 66201 of the Education Code), and in a manner consistent with Recommendations 18-22. But, as discussed in the section regarding special classes, some persons with developmental disabilities, particularly those in adult development centers and State hospitals, may not be able to benefit from postsecondary education as it is traditionally defined. The functional levels of adults with developmental disabilities in State hospitals is described as follows in the 1981 report to the Legislature by the Department of Developmental Services:

> 40 percent have difficulty with ambulation (ranging from 16 percent who are totally unable to creep or crawl, to 15 percent who walk unsteadily when not supported). Only 11 percent can carry on simple conversation and over 60 percent cannot say simple words. Eighty-four (84) percent require total assistance with grooming and 37 percent cannot eat with a utensil (pp. 7-8).

Moreover, some students with developmental disabilities have remained in special classes at State hospitals for years without making significant progress and are now beginning to reach the 4,000 hour limit which the State imposed on students in these programs several years ago. While this of course is not true of all participants, it does demonstrate that these programs differ from most operated by the Community Colleges in that they involve long-term support.

Another problem is that the system of providing support to the Community Colleges on the basis of total revenues per unit of ADA is not appropriate for all areas of instruction. In certain instances, the application of the total revenues per ADA method can cause serious distortions of public policy. Over the years, the Legislature has recognized this problem, and has provided varying methods of support when the kind of instruction is quite different from the norm. Some examples are:

- Since apprenticeship training differs from regular classroom instruction, apprenticeship reimbursements are provided at the rate of $3.25 per clock hour.

- The California Work-Site Educational Training Act provides funds to the Employment Development Department as block grants which are then negotiated with educational providers, including the Community Colleges.

- Rather than receiving the district's average revenues per ADA (the statewide average for 1982-83 is slightly over $1,900 per ADA), non-credit ADA is supported by the State at the flat rate of $1,100 for all districts.

Thus, the State's policy is that when certain kinds of instruction vary greatly--in terms of clientele or cost--the support method should more closely tailor the revenues to the costs than is the case under the average revenue per ADA method. This is done so that educational need, rather than fiscal incentives or discentives, determines decisions about programs.

The existing ADA mechanism and the concept of a class are not well adapted to providing the sort of long-term support which may be required for some adults with developmental disabilities. ADA rates were developed on the assumption that students would voluntarily attend classes, would do so for a limited number of hours per week, would not take the same class indefinitely, and would only remain in the class if they were making substantial progress. These assumptions do not always hold for the developmentally disabled. In fact, it may even be difficult to determine whether some persons with developmental disabilities are voluntarily enrolled in the class if they cannot communicate effectively. These problems are most pronounced and widespread in those programs operated in State hospitals and adult development centers.

Since adults with developmental disabilities do require these services, the practical choice is between transferring funding and responsibility for such services to another agency or developing a new system for delivering these services through the Community Colleges which overcomes the many problems created by the present arrangement. From a policy standpoint, it may be preferable to have Community Colleges provide the services since this promotes the goals of integrating persons with developmental disabilities into programs which serve all adults. Recommendation 24 below is consistent with this policy in that it would permit Community Colleges to continue serving adults with developmental disabilities in adult development centers and State hospitals, but it avoids questions about the ability of these students to benefit from instruction and problems with the ADA funding mechanism by transferring funding to the Department of Developmental Services and permitting that agency to purchase educational services for this population from Community Colleges or any other appropriate agency. As a practical matter, Recommendation 24 does not change the degree of integration of these programs, since the individuals in question will continue to receive educational services, will continue to reside and be served in the same facilities, and may in fact continue to be served by Community Colleges. The effect of the recommendation is to make decisions about services more consumer oriented.

RECOMMENDATION 24. The Legislature should transfer to the Department of Developmental Services funds now allocated to Community Colleges for programs serving adults with developmental disabilities in the State hospitals and in adult development centers. The Department of Developmental Services should use these funds exclusively to purchase on a fee for service basis the best available educational services for adults with developmental disabilities in the State hospitals and adult development centers. Such services may be purchased from Community Colleges, adult education programs operated by the Department of Education, or other appropriate agencies.

FOUR

CONCLUSION

This report has presented a review of programs for students with disabilities in public postsecondary education in California, explored a number of issues related to the funding and operation of these programs, and offered recommendations designed to resolve these issues. In general, these recommendations would accomplish several broad objectives:

- Recommendation 2 proposes a process for resolving on an intersegmental level a variety of problems related to programs for students with learning disabilities.

- Recommendation 3 reaffirms State policy as to the purposes of the programs and establishes a hierarchy among these purposes for the allocation of State funds.

- Recommendations 4 and 5 further the policy of integration of services in ways that take into account some of the practical difficulties in achieving this objective.

- Recommendations 13 and 14 establish procedures for the monitoring and evaluation of the programs.

- Recommendations 18 through 23 suggest new policies and improved implementation of existing policies regarding the funding and operation of special classes at Community Colleges.

- Recommendations 5, 17, and 24 propose procedures for coordination of services with the Departments of Rehabilitation, Transportation, and Developmental Services.

- Recommendations 6 through 12 suggest a new long-term funding system for these programs that will ensure equity between the segments while permitting each segment to offer additional services specifically designed to meet the needs of its students. This new system will replace funding decisions based on rough aggregate per capita formulas with a budgeting system based on estimates of the reasonable cost of providing a defined set of services, which is more accurate and sensitive to changes in need. This approach includes an initial process for determining reasonable cost rates and a further process for adjusting them in subsequent years.

The Commission believes that taken together these recommendations will improve services to students with disabilities. They will result in better coordination and funding of these programs and clearer definition of their purposes and obligations. In some cases, they call for rearranging responsibility for the delivery of services, but they will ensure that all persons with disabilities who are currently served by these programs continue to receive necessary services. They include a system

for monitoring the operation of the programs to determine the success of these proposed changes and the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the needs of students. Finally, they will bring the State considerably closer to resolving many of the issues related to these programs which have engendered controversy for the past few years and detracted from the primary objective of better serving students with disabilities.

APPENDIX A

SUPPORT SERVICES

(1) Interpreter services which are necessary to allow a student with a disability to complete the educational program.

(2) Reader services which are necessary to allow a student with a disability to complete the educational program.

(3) Notetaker services which are necessary to allow a student with a disability to complete the educational program. This may include transcription of notes and other related secretarial services.

(4) Mobility assistance. This may include on-campus transportation, wheelchair repair and loan, temporary assistance with transferring from vehicles, or other similar assistance. Mobility assistance does not include permanent attendant care or ongoing escort service.

(5) Registration assistance. This includes assisting a student to enroll in a particular class or section which is needed, but does not include giving a student with a disability absolute priority over any particular nondisabled student.

(6) Special parking.

(7) Facilitation of access to all programs. This involves planning and coordination services to assist the student with a disability in gaining access to classes and programs. This may include making arrangements to move a class to an accessible facility, or consulting with faculty members to ensure that they understand the needs of particular students. Facilitation of access to all programs does not include academic advising, personal counseling, vocational counseling, or tutoring.

(8) Access to special adaptive equipment including purchase thereof.

(9) Referral to appropriate on- or off-campus resources, services, and agencies.

(10) Arrangements for specialized educational materials, including purchase or preparation of such materials.

(11) Establishment and maintenance of a list of available readers, interpreters, notetakers, mobility assistants, and attendants.

(12) Supplemental orientation as determined by individual need. This means orientation to the physical environment of the college, which is in addition to that typically offered to all students upon entrance.

(13) Test-taking arrangements. This includes working with the faculty to ensure that tests are given in a fair and appropriate manner, taping or brailling tests, or arranging for administration of oral examinations. Test-taking arrangements do not include special diagnostic testing or counseling.

(14) Verification of disability. A professionally verified physical, communication, or learning disability means a condition certified by a licensed physician, psychologist, audiologist, speech pathologist, rehabilitation counselor, physical therapist, corrective therapist, or learning disability specialist. Where the nature and extent of the disability is obvious (e.g., amputee, blind, quadriplegic), the coordinator of the disabled student services program may verify the disability. In those cases where the coordinator is unable to verify the disability, the student shall either provide the verification documentation to the coordinator, or sign a release guaranteeing that the documentation, statement, or certification shall be made available to the college upon request to the appropriate professional or agency. Verification of a disability may include assessment for students with learning disabilities, and such assessments may be performed by qualified program staff.

(15) Specialized tutoring for the learning disabled, includes tutoring uniquely designed to meet the needs of students with learning disabilities that is not otherwise available through regular remedial programs.

APPENDIX B

Proposed Budget Projection Format

(All Figures in This Table are Entirely Hypothetical)

Type of Disability	Number of Students Served (Unduplicated Headcount)	Total Cost Per Disability Group
PHYSICAL DISABILITY		
Vision Impaired	350	$ 500,000
Mobility Impaired	4,000	1,000,000
Other Impairments	1,000	450,000
COMMUNICATION DISABILITY		
Speech Impaired	500	500,000
Hearing Impaired	120	500,000
Other Impairments	530	200,000
LEARNING DISABILITY	2,500	750,000
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY	1,000	800,000
TOTAL	10,000	$4,700,000[2]

1. The term "other common services" means the services listed in Appendix A that are common to all three segments, except those listed separately on this form.

2. The totals in columns 3 and 7 must be identical since they both reflect the total cost of operating programs for students with disabilities, even though they are derived in different ways. In column 3, costs for administration and expenditures from the contingency fund must be distributed across disability categories. The total in columns 3 and 7 represents the total cost of operating the program, and revenue from other sources must be subtracted to determine the State allocation.

APPENDIX C

CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES OF DISABILITIES

Disabilities - For State funding purposes, the following categories and subcategories of disabilities shall be used:

(1) Physical Disability - Disability attributable to (a) vision, (b) mobility, (c) orthopedic, or (d) other functional impairment, to the extent that the impairment necessitates procurement of supportive services or programs to provide access to the educational process.

(2) Communication Disability - Disability attributable to (a) speech, or (b) hearing impairment, to the extent that the impairment necessitates procurement of supportive services or programs to provide access to the educational process.

(3) Learning Disability - Specific learning disabilities are disorders in which the individual's ability to process language, read, spell, and/or calculate is significantly below expectancy as measured by an appropriate professional or agency despite conventional instruction, adequate intelligence, and sociocultural opportunity. Specific learning disabilities include dyslexia, dyscalculia, dysgraphia, agnosia, and dysphasia. Limitations caused by specific learning disabilities must impede access to the educational process in order to be considered a disability.

Source: Statewide Task Force, 1979, pp. 3-4.

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF THE STATEWIDE TASK FORCE ON SERVICES TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

AUGUST 22, 1979

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 12th STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

REPORT OF THE STATEWIDE TASK FORCE ON SERVICES TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

INTRODUCTION

In the past few years, both the California Legislature and the federal government have passed laws regarding the provision of postsecondary educational services to persons with disabilities. In 1976, the Governor signed AB 77 (Lanterman, Chapter 275, Statutes of 1976) into law, which provided special funding for services to students with disabilities in the California Community Colleges. AB 77 states that, "This act is intended to enhance opportunities within community colleges for handicapped students, but not to limit such students as to the type of postsecondary institution, if any, they attend."

Also, in 1976, the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 201, which directed the three public segments of California postsecondary education to ". . . prepare a plan that will provide for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, the underrepresentation of handicapped students in the make-up of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education." The California Postsecondary Education Commission was to integrate these plans and transmit them to the Legislature and Governor with comments. The resulting document, entitled A State Plan for Increasing the Representation of Students with Disabilities in Public Higher Education was adopted by the Commission in June 1978 and transmitted to the Governor and the Legislature. To date, the Legislature has not provided funding specifically to implement the provisions of ACR 201.

Then in May 1977, the federal government adopted regulations to implement Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794). The Act provides that:

> . . . no otherwise qualified handicapped person, shall, on the basis of handicap, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity which receives or benefits from federal financial assistance.

While the federal 504 regulations are extensive and cover, among other things, a broad range of postsecondary education services, the federal government, to date, has not allocated funds to institutions of higher education to implement the regulations.

Given both the federal regulations and the pre-existing State policies regarding services to postsecondary education students with disabilities, in June 1979, both houses of the Legislature, with the

support of the Department of Finance, approved the following as supplemental budget language:

> The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall convene a Task Force made up of the Department of Finance, Department of Rehabilitation, University of California, California State University and Colleges, and California Community Colleges, including handicapped persons and other interested groups, to develop and implement a common set of policy guidelines for disabled student educational service programs. Such guidelines shall be based upon (1) utilization of common definitions for disabilities and reasonable levels of educational service and (2) the number of verified disabled students by campus, the types and costs of services to be provided.
>
> The Task Force shall report to the Legislative Budget Committees and the Department of Finance: (1) by September 1, 1979, on the number of students to be served in each segment in 1979-80 at $465 per student and (2) by December 1, 1979, with the final report. The Department of Finance shall use the recommendations contained in the final report as the basis for budgeting for disabled students in 1980-81.

It was decided that in order to have all the policies and services in place for students with disabilities by Fall 1979. the Task Force should finish its work and make its final report to the Legislature by September 1, 1979. This is particularly important in light of the fact that the State Department of Rehabilitation has taken the position that such services as interpreters for deaf students and readers for blind students must be provided by educational institutions as of July 1, 1980, and not by the Department of Rehabilitation. (See Appendix A for the text of the Department's policy statement.)

The report which follows is the result of the work of this Task Force and is intended to provide a common set of policy guidelines for the provision of services to students with disabilities in each of the public segments of California postsecondary education.

STATEWIDE OBJECTIVE: INTEGRATION

The Task Force believes that the objective of all statewide and segmental planning to provide educational and supportive services to students with disabilities should be to integrate or "mainstream" the student into the general campus programs and activities as far and as quickly as possible. The ability of the student to function independently in the educational environment is the ultimate goal.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this report, the following definitions are adopted:

Campus - Any California Community College, any campus of the California State University and Colleges, or any campus of the University of California.

Systemwide Administration - The Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the Office of the Chancellor of the California State University and Colleges, and the Office of the President of the University of California.

Student - A person is a student as defined by the public postsecondary institution in which he or she is enrolled.

Student with a Disability - For general statistical purposes, campuses should use the following:

> . . . any person who (1) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities; (2) has a record of such an impairment; or (3) is ragarded as having such an impairment (Federal Rules and Regulations to implement section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; 42 C.F.R., 84.3, Definitions).

A qualified handicapped person with respect to postsecondary education services is defined in the same federal regulations as:

> . . . a handicapped person who meets the academic and technical standards requisite to admission or participation in the recipient's educational program or activity.

Disabilities - For State funding purposes, the following categories and subcategories of disabilities shall be used:

(1) Physical Disability - Disability attributable to (a) vision, (b) mobility, (c) orthopedic, or (d) other functional impairment, to the extent that the impairment necessitates procurement of supportive services or programs to provide access to the educational process.

(2) Communication Disability - Disability attributable to (a) speech, or (b) hearing impairment, to the extent that the impairment necessitates procurement of supportive services or programs to provide access to the educational process.

(3) Learning Disability - Specific learning disabilities are disorders in which the individual's ability to process language, read, spell, and/or calculate is significantly below expectancy as measured by an appropriate professional or agency despite conventional instruction, adequate intelligence, and sociocultural opportunity. Specific learning disabilities include dyslexia, dyscalculia, dysgraphia, agnosia, and dysphasia. Limitations caused by specific learning disabilities must impede access to the educational process in order to be considered a disability.

VERIFICATION OF DISABILITY

State funding of supportive services and programs for students with disabilities shall depend upon the number of students with professionally verified disabilities who are enrolled in each public segment and who request such services. A professionally verified physical, communication or learning disability means a condition certified by a licensed physician, psychologist, audiologist, speech pathologist, rehabilitation counselor, physical therapist, corrective therapist, or learning disability specialist. Where the nature and extent of the disability is obvious (e.g., amputee, blind, quadriplegic), the coordinator of the disabled student services program may verify the disability. In those cases where the coordinator is unable to verify the disability, the student shall either provide the verification documentation to the coordinator, or sign a release guaranteeing that the documentation, statement, or certification shall be made available to the college upon request to the appropriate professional or agency.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The following services for students with disabilities shall be considered core services to be provided by each campus, and shall be funded by the State. Availability of these services to any particular student may vary depending upon the nature of the individual's verified disability. The use of such services by any student with a disability shall be entirely voluntary. Wherever feasible, these services should be integrated into the regular campus student services.

(1) Interpreter services

(2) Reader services

(3) Notetaker services

(4) Mobility assistance

(5) Registration assistance

(6) Priority enrollment

(7) Special parking

(8) Facilitation of access to all programs

(9) Access to special adaptive equipment

(10) Referral to appropriate on- or off-campus resources, services, and agencies

(11) Arrangements for specialized educational materials

(12) Establishment and maintenance of a list of available readers, interpreters, notetakers, mobility assistants, and attendants

(13) Supplemental orientation as determined by individual needs

(14) Test-taking arrangements

Reader, interpreter, and notetaker services which allow students to complete the academic programs shall be provided as core services. Additional services may be offered and may be funded by the State based on the resources of each campus and the nature and needs of its disabled student population.

Attendants, individually prescribed devices, supportive services for personal use, or other devices or services of a personal nature shall not be provided.

Students with disabilities needing the assistance of supportive services, including readers and interpreters, shall be involved in the selection process to determine the appropriateness of the services and to ensure that the level of skills of any personnel under consideration is adequate.

Each systemwide administration shall ensure that the provision of services has been appropriately verified.

COSTS OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Since the provision of services to students with disabilities has been funded by the State primarily in only the California Community Colleges, and since it is not known whether the costs associated with such services may vary by segment, depending upon such things as the class level of the student and the nature of the academic program in which he or she is enrolled, data need to be collected to provide a clearer indication of the actual costs for supportive services in each segment.

Accordingly, each systemwide administration shall report by November 1, 1979 to the Department of Finance on (1) the estimated number of verified disabled students served (by disability category and sub-category), (2) the estimated annual costs of the core supportive services, and (3) the estimated annual costs of the basic administrative services for these programs. These estimates shall be revised during the budget process based upon the actual number of verified disabled students served in each segment and upor the actual costs incurred during the first term of the 1979-80 acadmeic year. Thereafter, such reports shall be part of the regular budget process.

If the actual costs for providing these core services and basic administrative services exceed the $465 per student allocated to a particular segment in the 1979-80 Budget Act, a supplemental appropriation shall be allocated to that segment's systemwide administration to provide core and basic administrative services during the remainder of the 1979-80 fiscal year, so that no student with a disability will be denied appropriate services during that period due to lack of funds.

After the 1979-80 budget year, refinements in the reporting process may be made as necessary, after consultation and agreement between the Department of Finance and the systemwide administrations.

State funds for services for students with disabilities shall be specifically restricted to use for that purpose. Guidelines shall be developed by each systemwide administration to ensure compliance with this restriction.

ACCOUNTABILITY/ADMINISTRATION

The Task Force believes that the following accountability mechanisms should be instituted (if not already present) in each segment:

Systemwide Coordinator - There should be one person or office within the systemwide administration responsible for the systemwide planning, development, and coordination of all programs and services for students with disabilities.

Campus Coordinator - There should be one person or office on the campus with the responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating all campus programs and services for students with disabilities. The role of the Campus Coordinator's office should be to encourage independence and self-reliance on the part of the student, while at the same time helping the student evaluate his or her needs for support services.

Systemwide Advisory Committee - This committee should be advisory to and recognized by the chief administrative officer of each segment. The committee should have substantial representation of students, faculty, and staff who are representative of as wide a variety of disabilities as possible. The committee may also include representatives of appropriate community or State agencies, consumer groups, and any other appropriate organizations or individuals. Functions of the Systemwide Advisory Committee should include: assisting in the implementation and evaluation of programs for services to students with disabilities; developing proposals as necessary for the revision of systemwide policies for students with disabilities; and advising the systemwide administration on the needs and concerns of students with disabilities.

Campus Advisory Committee - This committee should be advisory to and recognized by the chief administrative officer of the campus. The committee should have substantial representation of students, faculty, and staff who are representative of as wide a variety of disabilities as possible. The committee may also include representatives of appropriate community or State agencies, consumer groups, and any other appropriate organizations or individuals. Functions of the Campus Advisory Committee should include: assisting in the evaluation of current campus policies and procedures relating to students with disabilities; developing plans relating to programs and services for students with disabilities; setting priorities, developing timelines, and assisting in the estimation of costs associated with supportive services.

EVALUATIONS

Campus Evaluations - Each campus shall conduct an annual evaluation of its programs and services for students with disabilities which shall include the number of students served, services provided, and the costs of those services. These evaluations shall be submitted to the systemwide administration on an annual basis.

Systemwide Evaluations - In addition to the one-time, cost-of-services report to the Department of Finance (November 1, 1979), each systemwide administration should prepare, every other year, a narrative evaluation of how well their campuses are meeting the needs

of students with disabilities, the problems encountered (whether programmatic or budgetary), and the steps to be taken to resolve the problems. These segmental evaluations are to come to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on a biennial basis, with the first such evaluation due August 1, 1980.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Each systemwide administration should ensure that the grievance procedures in operation on each of its campuses are sufficient to meet the needs and concerns of students with disabilities.

mj/n/3-9

APPENDIX A

ate of California — Health and Welfare Agency

Memorandum

To : Judy Agan (Department of Finance) — Date : April 20, 1979

File No.:

Telephone: ATSS (916) 485-3971
(916) 445-3971

From : Department of Rehabilitation
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Subject: POLICY STATEMENT - POST SECONDARY EDUCATION - REVISED

The Department of Rehabilitation recognizes that it shares responsibility with educational systems as a provider of needed services to persons with disabilities. The concerns and goals of education and those of vocational rehabilitation are clearly compatible and every effort will be made to effectively and efficiently coordinate available services.

The Department is committed to maintaining close coordination with educational systems to assure that no eligible person with a disability becomes the casualty of what may appear to be conflicting responsibilities.

In accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, ACR 201 of 1976 and Chapter 275, Statutes of 1976 (AB 77), Department of Rehabilitation clients are entitled to receive supplemental services from the educational system on an equal basis with all other disabled students.

Examples of "supplemental services" that are the responsibility of the educational system are:

1. Interpreter services for the deaf and reader and note taker service for the blind related to educational programs
2. On-campus mobility assistance
3. On-campus transportation

These services are in addition to other responsibilities of the educational system to accomplish complete program and service accessibility, including redesign of equipment, reassignment of programs or activities to accessible buildings, and removal of architectural and communication barriers.

We understand that the UC and CSUC systems may need time to assume their responsibilities for disabled students who are DR clients. Therefore, the Department of Rehabilitation agrees to continue to pay for supplemental services for its clients through fiscal year 1979-80. After June 30, 1980, UC and CSUC should assume all costs for supplemental services to all disabled students to parallel the services rendered by the community college system.

The Department of Rehabilitation will continue to provide its traditional services to disabled students who are its clients. Examples of such services are:

1. Medical/psychiatric evaluation of disability
2. Physical, psychiatric or speech therapy
3. Individual diagnostic testing
4. Vocational rehabilitation counseling
5. Costs of off-campus transportation
6. Maintenance (supplemental Rehabilitation expense)
7. Mobility instruction
8. Prosthetic/orthotic maintenance and repair
9. Reader service for the blind and interpreter service for the deaf other than for educational programs
10. Job placement services
11. Payment of college fees (registration, books, supplies, etc.)

We strongly recommend that each college and university have an advisory committee concerning services to disabled students. Such an advisory committee should include a majority of disabled persons and should recommend guidelines and objectives to ensure full accessibility and monitor and evaluate the delivery of services to disabled students.

Further, we strongly recommend each educational system assign a full-time staff member to assist campuses in developing their program of services to disabled students.

EDWARD V. ROBERTS
Director

APPENDIX B

MEMBERS OF THE STATEWIDE TASK FORCE ON
SERVICES TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Betty Bacon, Coordinator
Disabled Student Services
San Diego State University

Ralph Black, President
Disabled Students Coalition

Hazel ten Broek
National Federation of the Blind,
Western Division

A.T. Brugger, Special Assistant
Student Affairs and Services
University of California

Joel Y. Bryan, Coordinator
Handicapped Students Program
University of California at Davis

Kathryn Clarke
National Federation of the Blind
of California

Janis Cox Coffey, Task Force Chairperson
California Postsecondary
Education Commission

Kim Connor
Department of Finance

Lisa Coyne, Secretary/Treasurer
Disabled Students Coalition

Sharon Gold, Student
Lancaster, California

Robert Harris, Director
Disabled Student Program
Chaffey College

Susan Hunter, Assistant Dean,
Student Affairs
California State University
and Colleges

Ann McClellan, Student
Riverside, California

John Mills
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Rosalie Passovoy, Student Affairs
and Services
University of California

Edward Pearson
Department of Rehabilitation

Brenda Premo, Student
Garden Grove, California

Alfred Roxburgh
Department of Finance

Ron Thayer, Student
Cupertino, California

REFERENCES

California Postsecondary Education Commission. A State Plan for Increasing the Representation of Students with Disabilities in Public Postsecondary Education. Commission Report 78-9. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1978

California Postsecondary Education Commission Staff. Funding for Programs Serving Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education. Final Draft. Sacramento: The Commission, August 1981.

The California State University. Report on Services to Students with Disabilities; Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by The California State University Division of Student Affairs. Long Beach: The California State University, September 1982.

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. Report to the Legislature on Handicapped Student Programs and Services in the California Community Colleges, Pursuant to Supplemental Language on Item 388.2 of the 1980 Budget Act. Sacramento: Chancellor's Office, February 1981.

Department of Developmental Services. Report to the Legislature on the Adult Education Study in State Hospitals Pursuant to Supplemental Language Under Item 687-101-001 of the 1981 Budget Act. Sacramento: The Department, 1981.

Department of Finance. Services to Students with Disabilities in Public Postsecondary Education, Prepared by State of California Department of Finance, Program Evaluation Unit. Sacramento: The Department, December 1981.

Hobbs, Nicholas. The Futures of Children: Recommendations of the Project on Classification of Exceptional Children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Statewide Task Force. Report of the Statewide Task Force on Services to Students with Disabilities. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, August 22, 1979.

University of California. Biennial Systemwide Evaluation, Services to Students with Disabilities. Berkeley: Systemwide Student Affairs and Services Office, University of California, September 30, 1982.